


3 1761 11649284 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

CAI X1

-D32

Government
Publication

Gov. Doc
can.
P

Canada, Parliament 35 I

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

951C

DOMINION OF CANADA,

18th Parliament

FOURTH SESSION.

Feb / April 1871

34 VICTORIÆ, 1871.

(VOLUME II.)

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE 15TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1871,

TO

THE 14TH DAY OF APRIL, 1871.

15-6770
21/10/20

OTTAWA.

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE OTTAWA TIMES PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO.

1871.



Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand
eight hundred and seventy-two, by JAMES BAILIFF, in the Office of the
Minister of Agriculture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME II.

SENATE, FEBRUARY 15TH, 1871.

	Page
MEETING OF PARLIAMENT	1
HOUSE OF COMMONS COMMANDED TO ATTEND IN SENATE CHAMBER	1
The Session opened by His Excellency the GOVERNOR GENERAL, LORD LISGAR	2
<i>Speech from the Throne</i>	3
NEW MEMBERS--Hon. Messrs. MacFarlane, Northup and Perry sworn in as members of the Senate	5
BILL- read <i>pro forma</i>	5
SPEECH--His Excellency's Speech ordered to be taken into consideration on Friday, 17th	5

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 15TH.

HOUSE returns from Senate Chamber	5
MEMBERS REMOVED from the House since previous Session	5
NEW MEMBERS introduced	6
SPEECH--Mr. Speaker presents copy to the House; to be considered to-morrow	6
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, Standing Committees &c	6
FISHERIES--Inquiry if it was the intention of the Government to bring down correspondence (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)	6

SENATE, FEBRUARY 16TH.

DECEASED SENATORS--The deaths of Hon. Messrs Ross, Crawford, and Anderson (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	8
ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE out of respect to deceased members	11

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 16TH.

ELECTIONS--Hochelaga Election Committee's Report	11
MANITOBA REPRESENTATIONS--Information respecting the representation from Manitoba desired (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)	11
NEW MEMBERS--Mr. Fournier, member for Bellechasse, introduced	13
FISHERIES--Explanations desired in view of meeting of Imperial Commission at Washington (<i>Hon. Sir A. T. Galt</i>)	13
ADDRESS in reply to Speech--Debate	16
ADDRESS in reply to Speech--Carried	26
CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS on account of honor conferred by Her Majesty Lord Lisgar (<i>Hon Sir John A. Macdonald</i>)	26

SENATE, FEBRUARY 17TH.

ADDRESS in answer to Speech--Debate thereon (<i>Hon Mr. MacFarlane</i>)	26
THE ADDRESS--adopted and ordered to be presented	40

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
[February 17]	
ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS--Enquiry concerning representation of (Mr. Ryan)	41

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 17TH.

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE--Enquiry concerning proposed railway bridge (Hon. Mr. Holton)	41
GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY--Motion for statement of earnings during certain years (Mr. Mackenzie)	42
MANITOBA--Address for instructions to Lieut.-Gov. Archibald and for copies of correspondence between Lt.-Gov. and Dominion Government (Mr. Mackenzie)	42
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS submitted (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks)	43
DEFENCE--statement of expenditure submitted (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks)	43
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES--motion for detailed statement of (Mr. Mackenzie)	43
BRITISH COLUMBIA--motion (Mr. Mackenzie)	43
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--motion (Mr. Mackenzie)	43
NORTH WEST CORRESPONDENCE--motion (Mr. Mackenzie)	44
MONTREAL WAREHOUSING COMPANY--motion (Hon. Mr. Holton)	44
SILVER QUESTION--statement asked for (Hon. Mr. Holton)	48
FISHERIES--Correspondence relative to asked for (Sir A. T. Galt)	50
DEFENCE--motion (Sir A. T. Galt)	50
MESSAGE--Governor General appoints Hon. Mr. Howe commissioner on internal economy of House.	52

SENATE, FEBRUARY 20TH.

CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS to LORD LISGAR (Hon. Mr. Campbell)	53
---	----

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 20TH,

BANKS AND BANKING--Bill to amend Acts concerning (Mr. Crawford)	54
CREDIT FONCIER--Bill to establish (Mr. Dufresne)	54
ROYAL CANADIAN BANK--Charter (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks)	54
NAVIGABLE WATERS--Bill for protection of (Mr. Cartwright)	54
MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS AND ASSEMBLIES--Bill to render them ineligible for seats in House of Commons (Mr. Mills)	54
EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS--Bill concerning (Mr. Mills)	54
HOCHELAGA ELECTION COMMITTEE--Final Report of (Hon. Mr. Irvine)	54
RED RIVER EXPEDITION--Question concerning (Mr. Stephenson)	54
DUTY ON COAL--Question concerning (Mr. McGill)	55
CANAL COMMISSION--Question by (Mr. McGill)	56
FISHERIES CORRESPONDENCE--Submitted to House (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald)	56
FENIAN RAID--Indemnity for, question by (Mr. Dufresne)	59
FENIAN RAID--Correspondence with Imperial Government in reference to compensation for (Mr. Mackenzie)	61
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Question (Mr. Mills)	61
DEFENCE, Correspondence asked for (Mr. Masson)	62
ST. CLAIR FLATS CANAL--Motion for correspondence (Mr. Mackenzie)	62
HARBOURS OF REFUGE on Western Lakes--Motion for correspondence (Mr. Oliver)	62
NORTH-WEST--Motion for return of indemnity claims (Mr. Bodwell)	62
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Motion concerning (Mr. Stirton)	64
MANITOBA--Imperial Legislation for (Mr. Blake)	64
DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS--When to be submitted to House (Mr. Mackenzie)	65

SENATE, FEBRUARY 21st.

FISHERIES--Question concerning (Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just)	66
STANDING COMMITTEES--Motion for the appointment of (Hon. Mr. Campbell)	67

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 21st.

CENSUS ACT--Bill to amend (Hon. Mr. Dunning)	68
--	----

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[February 21]	Page
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES--Return of (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	69
SILVER QUESTION--Exportation of American Silver and new Silver coins, explanations (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	69
DEFENCE--Mission of Hon. Mr. Campbell to England (<i>Sir A. T. Galt</i>).....	70
ELECTIONS BILL--Introduction of notified (<i>Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald</i>).....	71
COMMITTEES--Standing and Special report concerning concurred in (<i>Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald</i>).....	71
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS--Referred to Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	71
CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS to His Excellency the Governor General (<i>Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald</i>).....	72
THE ADDRESS.....	73
INLAND REVENUE--Question concerning (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>).....	74

SENATE, FEBRUARY 23rd.

NEW MEMBER--Hon. Mr. Panet sworn in.....	74
INSPECTION LAWS--Petition from Dominion Board of Trade praying for consolidation (<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>).....	74
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Notice of motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Wark</i>).....	75
ARBITRATION--Motion relative to that of Provinces of Quebec and Ontario (<i>Hon. Mr. Tessier</i>).....	75
FISHERIES--Motion for returns to stand over (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier de St Just</i>)...	75
STANDING COMMITTEES--Additional members of (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>).....	75

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 23RD.

GRAIN AND FLOUR DUTIES--Petition concerning, from Montreal Board of Trade (<i>Mr. Workman</i>).....	75
PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE--First Report (<i>Mr. Harrison</i>).....	75
COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS--First Report (<i>Mr. MacFarlane</i>).....	76
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS--First Report (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	76
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND COMMERCE--First Report (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	76
RAILWAY ACT OF 1868--motion to amend (<i>Mr. MacFarlane</i>).....	76
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING--notice to Senate [<i>Mr. Young</i>].....	76
CRIMINAL APPEALS--Bill to extend right of [<i>Mr. Harrison</i>].....	76
INDEPENDENCE OF SENATE--Bill for [<i>Mr. Blake</i>].....	76
MESSAGE in reply to Address of congratulation.....	76
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.....	76
GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY--Question concerning (<i>Mr. F. Jones</i>).....	77
SUPREME COURT BILL--Question concerning (<i>Mr. Blake</i>).....	77
CLERGY RESERVES--Question by (<i>Mr. Thompson, Ontario</i>).....	77
PATENT ACT--Question concerning (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>).....	77
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE--removal of--Question (<i>Mr. Delorme</i>).....	77
FRANCE--famine in--Question (<i>Mr. Fournier</i>).....	78
BAY VERTE CANAL- Question [<i>Mr. Burpee</i>].....	78
SILVER COINS--concerning withdrawal of 20 cent piece [<i>Mr. Cheval</i>].....	78
FISHERIES--Question [<i>Hon. Sir A. T. Galt</i>].....	79
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--motion concerning contracts [<i>Mr. F. Jones</i>].....	80
ARBITRATION--motion for correspondence touching arbitration and award [<i>Mr. Blake</i>].....	80

SENATE, FEBRUARY 24th.

MESSAGE from Commons intimating appointment of Library Committee.....	85
NEW MEMBER--Hon. Mr. Churchill.....	85
BANKING, COMMERCE, AND RAILWAYS COMMITTEE--First report of [<i>Hon. Mr. Hamilton</i>].....	85
STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE--First Report [<i>Mr. Sanborn</i>].....	85
REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL for 1870 (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)..	86
PRINTING JOINT COMMITTEE.....	86
ARBITRATION, Provincial, motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Tessier</i>).....	88
MESSAGE from His Excellency thanking House for their loyal address.....	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 24TH.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY, Petition (<i>Mr. John Crawford</i>)	99
NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS--Bill to amend Act relating thereto (<i>Mr. Cameron, Huron</i>)	99
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES--returns to be reported to Printing Committee (<i>Mr. Young</i>)	99
REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL presented (<i>Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald</i>)	99
SUPPLY BILL--Formal Bill granted	99
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION--Motion (<i>Hon. Sir A. T. Galt</i>)	99

SENATE, FEBRUARY 27TH.

FISHERIES--motion for correspondence (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just</i>)	130
--	-----

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 27TH.

DANGEROUS WEAPONS--Carrying of--Bill to amend Law respecting (<i>Mr. Harrison</i>)	140
COUNTY COURT JUDGES--Bill respecting (<i>Mr. Drew</i>)	140
PATENT ACT OF 1869--Bill to amend, (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>)	141
HASTINGS EAST RIDING--new writ for election to be issued (<i>Hon. Sir George E. Cartier</i>)	141
LAWS ASSIMILATION of, in the several provinces--preliminary report (<i>Hon. Sir George E. Cartier</i>)	141
CORRECTION in Report of speech--(<i>Mr. Fortier</i>)	142
GOULET, ELZEAR--question respecting death of, in Manitoba (<i>Mr. Masson, Soulanges</i>)	141
ELECTORAL DIVISIONS--readjustment of in New Brunswick (<i>Mr. Bollen</i>)	142
ARBITRATION--Provincial--Question (<i>Mr. Godin</i>)	143
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Question--(<i>Mr. Fournier</i>)	143
PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS--Question (<i>Mr. Drew</i>)	143
STAMPS--Sale of-- Motion for return (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>)	143
UNADJUSTED CLAIMS--Motion for correspondence between the Dominion and New Brunswick Governments (<i>Mr. Connell</i>)	144
ARBITRATION--Motion for name of employees of Local Governments in connection therewith [<i>Mr. Godin</i>]	145
RAILWAY ACT--Motion for address for copies of orders, as to forms in which returns should be made up [<i>Mr. Blake</i>]	146
HALIFAX PROVINCIAL BUILDINGS--Motion for correspondence [<i>Mr. Young</i>]	147
Do. Do. Do. --amendment thereto	148
NORTH WEST TERRITORY Extinguishment of claims--motion for address [<i>Mr. Young</i>]	151
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT--Resolution [<i>Mr. Blake</i>]	151
DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION--Motion for correspondence [<i>Mr. Blake</i>]	160
FENIAN RAID--Motion for address for correspondence relative to Canada claims against United States [<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>]	160
RED RIVER EXPEDITION--Motions for address relative to appointment of Chaplains [<i>Mr. Magill</i>]	164
RAILWAY BELLE LACHINE Canal--Motion for report of Chief Engineer of Public Works Department [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	174

SENATE, FEBRUARY 28TH.

BRITISH COPYRIGHTS--Motion for address for correspondence [<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>]	174
LIBRARY--Motion for Committee to inquire into duties, classification and remuneration of Librarian and other officers and servants (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	178
FISHERIES--Bill to amend act relative to fishing by foreign vessels (<i>Hon. Mr. Mitchell</i>)	178
BRITISH COLUMBIA--Papers in reference to admission to Union [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	178

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, FEBRUARY 28TH

	Page
LIBRARY--Remuneration, Classification, &c., of Officers [<i>Hon Sir G E Cartier</i>]	179
NEW MEMBERS--Mr. Pearson introduced by Messrs Carmichael and Killermund	179
ELECTIONS--Temporary provisional law of [<i>Hon. Sir. G. E. Cartier</i>]	179
BRITISH COLUMBIA--Message accompanying papers relative to admission to Union	182
CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS--His Excellency's reply thereto	182
BRITISH COLUMBIA--Papers to be printed [<i>Hon Sir. G. E. Cartier</i>]	183
FENIAN INVASION--Indemnity to Government for expenditure of \$200,000 [<i>Hon Sir F Hincks</i>]	183
SUPPLY TO HER MAJESTY--Motion of concurrence in report of Committee [<i>Hon Sir F Hincks</i>]	184
CENSUS ACT--Bill to amend, motion for second reading of (<i>Hon. Mr. Dunkin</i>)	184
INLAND REVENUE--Official returns and statistics [<i>Hon Mr Morris</i>]	185
ARBITRATION--Further consideration of Mr. Blake's motion.	185
CREDIT'S FONCLER--Second reading of Bill referred to Committee on Banking, Commerce &c. [<i>Mr Dufresne</i>]	191
NAVIGABLE WATERS--Bill for protection of [<i>Mr Cartwright</i>]	191
DUAL REPRESENTATION--Bill for an Act to render members of Provincial legislatures ineligible for sitting or voting in House of Commons [<i>Mr Mills</i>]	198

SENATE, MARCH 1st.

NEW MEMBERS--Honorable Messrs Smith and Read sworn in.	208
ARBITRATION--Between Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, motion [<i>Hon Mr Letellier, De St. Just</i>]	208
St. PETERS CANAL--Inquiry concerning [<i>Hon Mr Miller</i>]	209
INMAN STEAMSHIP LINE--Motion concerning contract with Post Office Department [<i>Hon Mr Dickey</i>]	211
MARINE AND FISHERIES--Papers connected with Act of last Session [<i>Hon Mr Mitchell</i>]	212
SECRETARY OF STATE--Annual Report [<i>Hon Mr Aikins</i>]	212

COMMONS, MARCH 1st.

INSOLVENT ACT OF 1849--Bill to Amend (<i>Mr. Savary</i>)	213
TRENTON--Bill to authorize village of to collect harbour dues, &c.,	213
CENSUS ACT--Report (<i>Hon. Mr. Dunkin</i>)	213
MESSAGE--Agreement between Imperial and Canadian Governments relative to admission into the union of Manitoba, and copies of agreements between the Dominion Government and Governments of Ontario and Quebec, respecting Arbitration award	213
ORDER IN COUNCIL--In the matter of Quebec and Ontario Arbitration read to House	213
ARBITRATION--Papers referred to Printing Committee [<i>Mr. Brousseau</i>]	217
TARIFF--Change of Duties on Flour, question [<i>Mr. Renaud</i>]	217
LAWS RELATIVE TO PROPERTY--Uniformity of in all the Provinces [<i>Hon. Mr. Smith</i>]	217
FENIAN RAIDS--Whether New Brunswick losses had been included in claims for indemnity [<i>Hon. Mr. Connell</i>]	218
MONEY ORDER POST OFFICE--If Government intended to re-establish office at Indiana, Ontario [<i>Mr. Thompson</i>]	218
CANADA, LATE PROVINCE of--Settlement of surplus debts and arrears [<i>Mr. Fortin</i>]	218
INSURANCE COMPANIES--Return of Companies which had made deposits [<i>Mr. Cameron, Huron</i>]	218
NORTH-WEST TERRITORY--Admission of Rupert's Land and North-West Territory to union (<i>Mr. Blake</i>).	220
LIQUOR INSPECTION FUND--Motion (<i>Mr. Bourrassa</i>)	220
RIMOUSKI--Harbour of Refuge at--correspondence concerning--(<i>Mr. Fournier</i>)	220
POST MASTERS--Remuneration of (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>)	226
CUSTOMS SEIZURES--by U. S. Customs Officers in Lake St. Clair [<i>Mr Stephenson</i>]	227
CANAL ENLARGEMENT--correspondence concerning [<i>Mr. Magill</i>]	227

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SENATE, MARCH 2ND.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORY--Bill to provide for its Government, first Reading (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	234
ARBITRATION PROVINCIAL--Motion deferred (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just</i>)	234
CANAL COMMISSION--Notice of Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>)	235
MONTREAL WATER POLICE--Notice of Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Bureau</i>)	235
POST OFFICE, RIVIERE OUELLE--Notice of Motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just</i>) ..	235

COMMONS, MARCH 2ND.

ONTARIO BANK--Petition for Extension of Charter (<i>Mr. Gibbs</i>)	235
RAILWAY, KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE--Petition of County of Frontenac, (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)	235
MONTREAL WAREHOUSING COMPANY--Papers submitted (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>)	235
RAILWAY ACT OF 1868--Bill to amend--First reading (<i>Hon. J. H. Cameron</i>)...	235
ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY--Bill to incorporate--First reading (<i>Mr. Crawford, Leeds</i>)	235
OWEN SOUND--Bill to authorize the collection of Harbour dues, first reading (<i>Mr. Snider</i>)	235
ALIENS--Bill to naturalize certain persons (<i>Mr. Young</i>)	235
MONTREAL WAREHOUSING COMPANY--Motion to refer papers to printing Committee (<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>)	236
MESSAGE, from His Excellency the Governor General relating to Public Lands, Manitoba	236
NAVIGATION AND SEAMANSHIP--Schools for teaching--Enquiry (<i>Mr. Pelletier</i>)	239
WELLAND CANAL--Motion for papers relating to Lake Erie Level (<i>Mr. Merritt</i>)	239
FISHERIES--Motion for address for regulations and Papers emanating from Gov- ernor in Council (<i>Mr. Mills</i>)	246
WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS--Enquiry (<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>) ..	247
DUTIES ON COAL, COKE, FLOUR, WHEAT, &c.--Motion for repeal (<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>) ..	247
ARBITRATION PROVINCIAL--Motion for discharge of Order (<i>Mr. Blake</i>)	247

SENATE, MARCH 3RD.

UNION BANK, LOWER CANADA--Petition reported on (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)..	248
QUEBEC BANK--Petition reported on (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)	248
GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY--Petition reported on (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)	248
SYDNEY, MABOU HARBOR AND FALSE BAY BEECH, C.B.--Notice of Motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Bourinot</i>)	248
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Balford</i>)	248
BAY VERTE CANAL AND CANAL COMMISSION--Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>)	248
ST. PETER'S CANAL--Explanation (<i>Hon. Mr. Miller</i>)	250
BILL TO AMEND ACT RESPECTING FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS--2nd reading (<i>Hon. Mr. Mitchell</i>)	252

COMMONS, MARCH 3RD.

ACCOUNTS MEMBERS--Improper practices. [<i>Hon. J. H. Cameron</i>]	255
BILL RELATING TO BANKS AND BANKING--1st reading [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	255
BILL TO PREVENT CORRUPT PRACTICES IN RELATION TO COLLECTION OF REVENUE--1st reading [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	256
FENIAN RAID--Message from His Excellency received and read, House go into Committee to consider, Motion [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	256
SAVINGS BANKS AND DOMINION NOTES--House in Committee of the Whole to consider resolutions [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	257
CENSUS ACT--Bill to amend, House in Committee of whole Col. Grey in chair.	257
ASSIMILATION OF CURRENCY--resolutions [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	258

SENATE, MARCH 6TH.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY--Motion for select Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Wark</i>]..	266
---	-----

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[March 6]	
REGATTA—Enquiry relative to the prohibition of Platforms at Lachme, (Hon. Mr. Bureau)	Page 271
RIVIERE OUELLE POST OFFICE—Motion for an Address concerning [Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just]	271
ARBITRATION—Motion deferred.	274
MANITOBA—Bill to extend Criminal Law to [Hon. Mr. Campbell]	274
NORTH WEST TERRITORY—Bill for government of [Hon. Mr. Campbell]....	274

COMMONS, MARCH 6TH.

PREMIUM NOTES—Bill to remove doubts concerning (Mr. Harrison)	275
FINANCE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES—Explanation (Hon. Sir F. Hincks) ..	275
ESTIMATES—Message from His Excellency	276
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES—Enquiry concerning deficiency in emoluments of (Mr. McFarlane)	276
ST. JOHN & MADAWASKA RIVERS—Question concerning intended improvements (Mr. Costigan)	276
LEGISLATIVE UNION—Enquiry concerning (Hon. Mr. Smith) ..	277
VEGETABLE IVORY NUT—Question concerning (Mr. Bowman)	277
RED RIVER EXPEDITION—Motion for copies of Orders in Council concerning (Mr. Masson, Soulanges)	277
EMIGRATION AGENT—Address for copies of resolutions to Mr. J. G. Moylan (Hon. W. McDougall)	278
FISHERIES—Notice for Address for copies of correspondence between Marine and Fisheries Department and Admiral Wellesley (Mr. Masson, Soulanges) ..	281
NORTH WEST EXPEDITION—Motion for Address for statement of vessels chartered to carry men and materials (Mr. McCallum)	282
ARBITRATION—Motion for House in Committee on question of (Hon. Mr. Dorion) ..	282
ORDER—Question of [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier] ..	286
CRIMINAL JUSTICE—Motion for return of convicts in Penitentiaries [Mr. Harrison]	288
GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—Resolution concerning Nova Scotia roads [Mr. Bodwell]	289
PRIVILEGE—A Question of [Hon. Mr. McDougall]	296

SENATE, MARCH 7TH.

PRINTING—Report of Committee on [Hon. Mr. Simpson]	267
CAPE BRETON MAIL STEAMERS—Question concerning [Hon. Mr. Bourinot] ..	297
NORTH WEST TERRITORIES—Observations on [Hon. Mr. Bureau]	298

COMMONS, MARCH 7TH.

PRINTING—Joint Committee's Report [Mr. Brousseau]	301
STANDING ORDERS—Fourth Report of Committee (Mr. Macfarlane)	301
PUBLIC WORKS—Report of Minister of [Hon. Mr. Langevin]	301
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Admission to Union [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	301
PARLIAMENT—Motion for Bill to secure independence of [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	301
MILITIA—Notice of Bill to amend Act [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	302
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—Resolutions relative to inspection of and introduction of metric system [Hon. Mr. Morris]	302
INSPECTION LAWS—Consolidation of [Hon. Sir F. Hincks]	302
CENSUS ACT—Bill to amend—Third reading of [Hon. Mr. Dunkin]	302
CURRENCY—Motion for concurrence in resolutions for assimilation of [Hon. Sir F. Hincks]	302
ELECTION OF MEMBERS—Bill to make temporary provisions for [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	309
SUPPLY—House moved into Committee on [Hon. Sir F. Hincks]	317
FENIAN RAID—Indemnity to Government for expenditure of \$200,000 [Hon. Sir F. Hincks]	317
SAVINGS BANKS—House in Committee (Hon. Sir F. Hincks)	317

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SENATE, MARCH 8TH.

STANDING ORDERS AND PRIVATE BILLS—Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>).....	825
MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA—Bill to incorporate (<i>Hon. Mr. Allan</i>).....	325
FISHERIES—Bill to amend Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels (<i>Hon. Mr. Mitchell</i>).....	326
NORTHWEST—Amendments in Bill for government of.....	327
COPYRIGHTS—Return concerning (<i>Hon. Mr. Aikins</i>).....	327
INTERCOLONIAL RAILROAD— <i>Hon. Mr. Tessier</i> added to Committee.....	327
PRIVILEGE—Remarks concerning aspersions upon <i>Hon. Mr. Miller</i> (<i>Hon. Mr. Wilnot</i>).....	327

COMMONS, MARCH 8TH.

DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION—Bill to incorporate [<i>Mr. Young</i>].....	328
TORONTO CORN EXCHANGE—Bill to incorporate [<i>Mr. Beatty</i>].....	328
NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA—Motion for leave to introduce a Bill for an Act, &c., [<i>Hon. Mr. Pope</i>].....	328
STATUTES—Return concerning distribution of (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>).....	328
MONTREAL POST OFFICE—Enquiry respecting site for intended new office [<i>Mr. Workman</i>].....	328
EASTERN AND NORTH AMERICAN RAILWAY—Rolling stock of—Enquiry (<i>Mr. Wallace</i>).....	328
MANITOBA—Immigrants' route to (<i>Mr. Brown</i>).....	329
BERTHIER VOLUNTEERS—Payment of (<i>Mr. Paquet</i>).....	329
STERLING EXCHANGE—Question by [<i>Mr. Workman</i>].....	329
GOVERNMENT RAILWAY TARIFFS—Motion for correspondence concerning (<i>Mr. Bolton</i>).....	330
FRANKING PRIVILEGE—Motion for instructions to be given to Postmasters to take account of all free mail matters passing through their hands [<i>Mr. Thompson, Haldimand</i>].....	331
CONVICIS—Motion for returns of [<i>Mr. Harrison</i>].....	331
GRAIN AND FLOUR—Imports of [<i>Mr. Ross, Dundas</i>].....	333
GRAND TRUNK RETURNS—Motion concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>].....	333
PRESQUE ISLE—Motion for address for correspondence concerning (<i>Mr. Keeler</i>).....	335
MAILS—Arrivals and departure of—Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Mills</i>].....	335
ST. PETER'S CANAL—Motion for address for statement of tolls (<i>Mr. Macdonald, Glengarry</i>).....	336
HAMILTON AND PORT DOVER PLANK AND STONE ROAD COMPANY—Enquiry [<i>Mr. Thompson, Haldimand</i>].....	340
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RETURNS—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>).....	341
INDIANS OF THE DOMINION, Returns submitted (<i>Hon. Mr. Howe</i>).....	341
INSURANCE COMPANIES—Returns submitted (<i>Hon. Mr. Howe</i>).....	342
SUPPLY—Motion to receive Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).....	342
BILL FOR EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS—Motion 2nd reading (<i>Mr. Mills</i>).....	342
Amendment that the Bill be read this day 6 months (<i>Mr. Langlois</i>).....	355

SENATE, MARCH 9TH.

ARBITRATION, PROVINCIAL—Motion discharged (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier De St Just</i>).....	356
LACHINE REGATTA, Motion for address [<i>Hon. Mr. Bureau</i>].....	356
INMAN STEAMSHIP LINE—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>).....	356
CENSUS ACT—Message from Commons, announcing passage.....	357
FISHERIES PROTECTION BILL, 3rd reading and passage.....	358
CRIMINAL LAW BILL, Manitoba, 2nd reading postponed.....	358
PRINTING—Joint Committee Report adopted (<i>Hon. Mr. Simpson</i>).....	358

COMMONS, MARCH 9TH.

RAILWAY ACT 1868—Bill to amend introduced (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>).....	359
RAILWAY COTEAU LANDING TO OTTAWA, Bill to incorporate introduced (<i>Mr. Macdonald, Glengarry</i>).....	359

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[March 9]		
INSOLVENT ACT—Bill to amend, leave asked [Mr. Godin]	359
HARBOUR MASTER HALIFAX, papers submitted [Hon. Dr. Tupper]	359
PORT COCAGNE, an Inland Port—Enquiry [Mr. Renaud]	359
WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS, Enquiry about papers [Mr. Cartwright]	359
POST OFFICE TORONTO—Returns of Tenders (Mr. Young)	
ARMS GIVEN OVER TO IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT—Enquiry (Mr. Masson, Terrebonne)	359
ARBITRATION AWARD—Address to Her Majesty (Hon. Mr. Dorion)	360

SENATE, MARCH 10TH.

POST OFFICE, RIVIERE OUELLE—Returns [Hon. Mr. Aikins]	270
CAPE BRETON MATTERS—Enquiry—[Hon. Mr. Bourinot]	370
PRINTING—4th and 5th Reports [Hon. Mr. Sanborn]	371
CRIMINAL LAWS, MANITOBA, 2nd Reading [Hon. Mr. Campbell]	371

COMMONS, MARCH 10TH.

BUDGET—Motion in amendment (Hon. Sir A. T. Galt)	406
Amendment lost on Division	415

SENATE, MARCH 13TH.

SUPERIOR JUDGES—EQUALIZATION OF SALARIES, Notice of Enquiry [Hon. Mr. Miller]	416
NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, Bill introduced (Hon. Mr. Campbell)	416

COMMONS, MARCH 13TH.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY ACT, Financial Affairs (Mr. Cartwright)	416
GRAIN AND FLOUR IMPORTS 1870—Returns (Hon. Mr. Tilley)	416
STERLING EXCHANGE—Returns, Amount purchased 1870 (Hon. Sir F. Hincks)	416
LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE—Correspondence (Hon. Mr. Langevin)	417
MANITOBA RETURNS (Hon. Mr. Howe)	417
POSTMASTER KINGSTON, N. B., SALARY, Enquiry (Mr. Renaud)	417
MARINE HOSPITAL, RICHIBUCTOU—Enquiry (Mr. Renaud)	417
MAILS FORTNIGHTLY, HALIFAX TO LIVERPOOL, Enquiry (Mr. Jones)	417
VESSELS ATTACHED FOR DEBT, House in Committee (Mr. Street)	417
ARBITRATION, PROVINCIAL—Debate continued	421
Division List on Mr. Holton's amendment	448
ST. PETER'S CANAL—Repairs [Hon. Mr. Langevin]	417
ARBITRATION, PROVINCIAL—Amendment (Mr. Mills)	449
Division List—Mr. Mills' amendment	449
ARBITRATION, PROVINCIAL—Amendment (Mr. Joly)	450
Division List—Mr. Joly's amendment	451
ARBITRATION, PROVINCIAL—Amendment (Hon. Mr. Dorion)	451
Division List—Mr. Dorion's amendment	451

SENATE, MARCH 14TH.

CENSUS ACT—Bill to amend, 2nd reading (Hon. Mr. Campbell)	452
PRINTING, 4th Report Joint Committee (Hon. Mr. Sanborn)	452
GEOLOGICAL REPORT—Enquiry (Hon. Mr. Dickey)	453
MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA—Bill to incor- porate, 2nd reading (Hon. Mr. Allan)	453
CRIMINAL LAW MANITOBA—House in Committee on Bill, 3rd reading	454

COMMONS, MARCH 14TH.

CUSTOMS, Notice to move House into Committee [Hon. Mr. Morris]	455
KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RAILWAY CO.—Bill to incorporate [Mr. Kirk- patrick]	455

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[<i>March 14</i>]	<i>Page</i>
FORSYTH MINING CO.—Bill to incorporate [<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>]	455
ISOLATED RISK FIRE INSURANCE CO.—Bill to incorporate [<i>Mr. Harrison</i>]	455
TORONTO AND NIPISSING RAILWAY, Bill to establish powers [<i>Mr. Harrison</i>]	455
BANKING RESOLUTIONS—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	455
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Notice of House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	456
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	457
INSPECTION LAWS—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	457
FENIAN INVASION EXPENDITURE—Report of Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	457
ELECTION LAW—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	457
SAVINGS BANKS—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	463
WAYS AND MEANS—House in Committee on resolutions	463
HEMLOCK BARK—Export duty recommended	466

SENATE, MARCH 15TH.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE—4th Report (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)	473
JUDGES' SALARIES—Equalization (<i>Hon. Mr. Miller</i>)	474
RICHIBUCTOU HARBOUR (<i>Hon. Mr. Wark</i>)	475
CURRENCY ASSIMILATION—Petition Halifax (<i>Hon. Mr. Locke</i>)	480
NORTH SHORE RAILWAY—Exemption Bill (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	480
CENSUS—House in Committee on Bill to amend Act	482

COMMONS, MARCH 15TH.

QUEBEC—Petition from Merchants of for repeal of flour, coal, and grain duties [<i>Messrs. Simard and Tourangeau</i>]	482
MARINE AND FISHERIES—Report of Minister of [<i>Hon. Dr. Tupper</i>]	482
ACCOUNTS—Enquiry concerning correspondence relative to adjustment of accounts between New Brunswick and Dominion [<i>Mr. Anglin</i>].	482
MILITIA DEPARTMENT—Enquiry concerning report of [<i>Mr. Thompson, Haldimand</i>]	482
MANITOBA INLAND REVENUE—Resolutions concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	482
COLLECTION OF REVENUE—3rd reading of Act for prevention of corrupt practices (<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>)	482
SAVINGS BANKS—Reception of Report upon [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	483
WAYS AND MEANS—Reception of Report of Committee [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	483
MANITOBA—Bill from Senate to extend certain laws relating to timber.	492
UNIFORM CURRENCY—Bill to establish—House in Committee on	492
BILLS PASSED—To authorize Trenton to impose and collect Harbour dues.	492
“ “ “ Owen Sound “ “ [amended].	492
SUPPLY—House in Committee on	493
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—House in Committee on Bill to establish uniform system of.	496
INSPECTION LAWS—House in Committee to consider a resolution for consolidation of	496

SENATE, MARCH 16TH.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Hazen</i>)	497
RAW HIDES—Petition from Montreal Traders (<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>)	497
WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS—Papers submitted (<i>Hon. Mr. Aikins</i>)	497
GEOLOGICAL REPORT—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>)	497
LIEUT. GOVERNORS' SALARIES (<i>Hon. Mr. Miller</i>)	497
CENSUS ACT—Bill to amend, 3rd reading and passed	499
PRINTING—5th Report Joint Committee (<i>Hon. Mr. Simpson</i>)	499
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Resolutions (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)	499
CANAL COMMISSION—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>)	500
SYNOD BILL—Bill to extend provisions to New Brunswick (<i>Hon. Mr. Wilnot</i>)	501

COMMONS, MARCH 16TH.

DOMINION TELEGRAPH CO.—Bill to incorporate (<i>Hon. J. H. Cameron</i>)	501
BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.—Enquiry (<i>Mr. Currier</i>)	501

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[<i>March 16</i>]		
CANAL COMMISSION—Enquiry (<i>Mr. Keeler</i>)	Page 502
DOMINION DAY—Enquiry—General Holiday (<i>Mr. Keeler</i>)	502
DEFENCE, Enquiry (<i>Sir A. T. Galt</i>)	502
SEA-GOING SHIPS—Masters and Mates (<i>Mr. Pelletier</i>)	502
SAVINGS BANKS QUEBEC—Rate of interest, (<i>Hon. Mr. Dorion</i>)	502
GEORGE STERLING—Correspondence about claims, (<i>Mr. Currier</i>)	502
PRIVATE BILLS—Returns of moneys received (<i>Mr. Pickard</i>)	502
PRINTING 4th and 5th reports—Committee on Printing (<i>Mr. Brousseau</i>)	503
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Motion for returns, (<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>)	503
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Statement of imports (<i>Mr. Mills</i>)	503
COAL, COKE & FLOUR—New Brunswick Imports (<i>Mr. Burpee</i>)	503
NORTH WEST TERRITORY—Enquiry, (<i>Mr. Bown</i>)	504
LIEUT. GOVERNOR ARCHIBALD—Enquiry, (<i>Mr. Cameron, Huron</i>)	504
HARBOUR DUES, Trenton, 3rd reading Bill [<i>Mr. Bown</i>]	506
HARBOUR DUES, Owen Sound—3rd Reading Bill, (<i>Mr. Snider</i>)	506
RAILWAY ACT 1868—Bill to amend, 2nd reading (<i>Mr. MacFarlane</i>)	506
CRIMINAL CASES—Bill to extend right of appeal, 2nd reading (<i>Mr. Harrison</i>)	509
NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS—Bill to amend Act, 2nd reading (<i>Mr. Cameron, Huron</i>)	510
DANGEROUS WEAPONS—Bill to extend law, 2nd reading (<i>Mr. Harrison</i>)	511
COUNTY COURT JUDGES ACT—2nd reading Bill (<i>Mr. Drew</i>)	511
INSOLVENT ACT, 1869—Bill to amend, 2nd reading (<i>Mr. Godin</i>)	512
MUTUAL INSURANCE COS.—Stamps on Premium Notes Bill—2nd reading (<i>Mr. Harrison</i>)	514
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>)	516
INSPECTION LAWS—Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	517

SENATE, MARCH 17TH.

CURRENCY—Notice of Enquiries, (<i>Hon. Mr. Hazen</i>)	517
MANITOBA—Enquiry, (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickson</i>)	518
MESSAGE FROM COMMONS, respecting Census and Revenue Acts	518

COMMONS, MARCH 17TH.

KINGSTON BOARD OF TRADE—Bill to incorporate (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)	518
POLASKI CLARKE—Bill to naturalize (<i>Mr. Crawford, Leeds</i>)	519
INSOLVENCY LAWS—Bill to repeal, (<i>Mr. Colby</i>)	519
OAKVILLE HARBOUR—House in Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	520
INSURANCE COMPANIES—House in Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	520
NORTH WEST—No intimation of insurrection (<i>Hon. Mr. Howe</i>)	520
SUPPLY—Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	520
INSURANCE COMPANIES—Returns submitted, (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	525
CURRENCY—Assimilation, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	521
CURRENCY—Amendment, (<i>Mr. Macdonald, Lunenburg</i>)	523
CURRENCY—Amendment, (<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>)	526
CURRENCY—Amendment, (<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>)	527
Division List— <i>Mr. Jones, Amendment</i>	527
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Message from His Excellency	527
INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA—Bill to incorporate (<i>Mr. Workman</i>)	528
PRIVATE BILLS—Return of moneys received on account	528
SUPPLY—House in Committee	528

SENATE, MARCH 20TH.

INTEREST—Notice of Enquiry, (<i>Hon. Mr. Dever</i>)	534
BRITISH COLUMBIA—Enquiry deferred (<i>Hon. Mr. Hazen</i>)	535
RICHIBUCTOU HARBOUR—Enquiry (<i>Hon. Mr. Wark</i>)	535
PRINTING—5th Report Joint Committee (<i>Hon. Mr. Simpson</i>)	536
SYNOD BILL—2nd reading (<i>Hon. Mr. Wilnot</i>)	536
COLLECTION OF REVENUE—2nd reading Bill (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	536

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
COMMONS, MARCH 20TH.	
BAY VERTE CANAL, Reply to enquiry, (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>)	536
DEFENCE, returns from 17th Feby. to 1st May 1870, (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)	536
CURRENCY---Enquiry---(<i>Mr. Hazen</i>)	557
SENATE, MARCH 21st.	
BRITISH COLUMBIA---Enquiry [<i>Hon. Mr. Miller</i>]	557
COMMUNICATION, Lieut. Governor Musgrave to Governor General.	564
COMMUNICATION, Governor General to Lieut. Governor Musgrave.	564
SYNOD BILL, Suspension 60th Rule, (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>)	566
INLAND REVENUE, House in Committee	566
COMMONS, MARCH 21st.	
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Returns, Exports and Imports (<i>Hon. Mr. Tilley</i>)	566
LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE, Returns, (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>)	566
MARINE POLICE, Statement of expenditure 1870 (<i>Hon. Dr. Tupper</i>)	566
FARMERS' BANK, Bill to incorporate (<i>Hon. Mr. Dunkin</i>)	567
METROPOLITAN BANK, Bill to incorporate [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	567
EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT, Bill to indemnify Members [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	567
INLAND REVENUE, Report of Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	567
SUPPLY, Report of Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	568
SUPPLY, Inland revenue Items	581
Do. Post Office items	581
Do. Public Works items	582
CAKVILLE HARBOUR, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	582
INSURANCE COMPANIES, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	582
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Notice of Bill [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	583
SENATE, MARCH 22nd.	
SPEAKER, Motion of Sympathy with [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	583
COMMONS, MARCH 22nd.	
VOTE BY BALLOT, Bill introduced [<i>Mr. Tremblay</i>]	583
SUN INSURANCE COMPANY, Bill to incorporate [<i>Mr. Workman</i>]	583
FORT WARDEN, QUEBEC, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	584
TANK OF UPPER CANADA, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	584
IMPERIAL GUARANTEE LOAN, House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	584
PACIFIC RAILWAY, Petition, Mr. Waddington [<i>Mr. Harrison</i>]	585
CUSTOMS ACT, Bill to amend 2nd reading	585
CUSTOMS ACT, Amendment [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	585
CUSTOMS ACT, Amendment [<i>Mr. Blanchet</i>]	589
FREDERICTON AND St. MARY'S BRIDGE CO., Bill to Incorporate, 2nd reading [<i>Mr. Pickard</i>]	591
CUSTOMS ACT, Debate resumed	591
Division List, Mr. Blanchet's Amendment	592
CUSTOMS ACT, Amendment [<i>Mr. Colby</i>]	595
CUSTOMS ACT, Mr. Colby's Amendment ruled out of order	597
Division List on Mr. Holton's Amendment	598
COMMONS, MARCH 23RD.	
WESTERN BANK, Bill to Incorporate [<i>Mr. Killam</i>]	599
SUN INSURANCE CO., Bill withdrawn [<i>Mr. Workman</i>]	599
INSOLVENT ACT 1869, Bill to amend [<i>Mr. Magill</i>]	599
QUEBEC MARINE AND FIRE INSURANCE Co., Bill to Incorporate [<i>Mr. Simard</i>]	599

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[<i>March 23</i>]	<i>Page</i>
FEMALE CONVICTS, Bill to provide for detention in Reformatory Prison [<i>Hon. Mr. Irvine</i>]	599
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Reports of Debate [<i>Hon. Sir George E. Cartier</i>]	599
WEST INDIES, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Forbes</i>]	600
PROMISSORY NOTES, STAMP ACT, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>]	600
PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Halifax,	625
CONFEDERATION LIFE ASSOCIATION, Bill 3rd reading (<i>Mr. Young</i>)	627
TORONTO CORN EXCHANGE ASSOCIATION, 3rd reading Bill (<i>Mr. Beatty</i>)	627
ONTARIO BANK, Bill to amend Charter, 3rd reading (<i>Hon. Mr. Cameron</i>)	627
ONTARIO & QUEBEC RAILWAY CO., 3rd reading (<i>Mr. Crawford, Leeds</i>)	627
MONTREAL & OTTAWA JUNCTION RAILWAY CO., 3rd reading (<i>Mr. Macdonald, Glengarry</i>)	627
BANKS AND BANKING, Bill to amend, 3rd reading (<i>Mr. Crawford, Leeds</i>)	628
SUPPLY, Halifax Public Buildings, debate resumed,	628

COMMONS, MARCH 27TH.

FREDERICTON & ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO., 3rd reading Bill postponed	641
ILLEGAL MARRIAGES, Bill to legalize (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)	641
CANAL COMMISSION, Report presented [<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>]	642
NORTH SHORE RAILWAY, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Paquet</i>]	642
POSTAGE AGRICULTURAL NEWSPAPERS, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Gendron</i>]	643
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Masson, Soulanges</i>]	643
CANADA GAZETTE, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Fournier</i>]	643
CIVIL SERVICE, Enquiry [<i>Hon. Mr. Blanchet</i>]	643
RAILWAY SUPPLIES NOVA SCOTIA, Enquiry [<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>]	643
ILLEGAL SEIZURES, motion for correspondence, [<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>]	644
ORDERS IN COUNCIL—Departmental Regulations, motion [<i>Mr. Mills</i>]	644
PENSION LISTS, Order of House [<i>Mr. Bolton</i>]	645
JOSEPH BOUCHETTE, copies of Petition [<i>Mr. Fortin</i>]	645
ACADIA FIRE INSURANCE CO., Correspondence [<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>]	645
NORTH WEST TERRITORY, Debate resumed	646
DIVISION LIST— <i>Mr. Dorion's</i> amendment	647
“ <i>Sir Geo. E. Cartier's</i> amendment	647
NEW MEMBER, introduced— <i>Mr. Whyte, East Hastings</i>	648
NORTH WEST TERRITORY—Amendment [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	649
DIVISION LIST— <i>Mr. Holton's</i> amendment	650
“ On amended motion	651
INDEPENDENCE OF SENATE, Bill—2nd reading [<i>Mr. Blake</i>]	651
DIVISION LIST on 2nd reading	653
GALLERIES CLEARED, Strangers in gallery [<i>Hon. Mr. Macdougall</i>]	655

SENATE, MARCH 28TH.

DRAWBRIDGES, over navigable rivers, petition concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>]	655
OTTAWA BOARD OF TRADE, Petition respecting railway from Toronto [<i>Hon. Mr. Skead</i>]	655
LACHINE REGATTA, Returns in connection with [<i>Hon. Mr. Mitchell</i>]	655
REPORT, Standing Committee relative to Life Assurance, &c. [<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>]	655
NEW BRUNSWICK SYNOD, Bill read a third time [<i>Hon. Mr. Wilmot</i>]	656
DRAWBRIDGES, Bill concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	656
PRIVATE BILLS, Time for receiving petitions extended [<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>]	657
MESSAGE, from Commons, Bills passed	657
IRON COMPANY, Forsyth Iron Company's Petition referred back to Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Macpherson</i>]	657
UNCURRENT NOVA SCOTIA NOTES, question concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Hazen</i>]	658
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Enquiries concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Hazen</i>]	658
REVENUE, Collection of, Bill to prevent corrupt practices	659

COMMONS, MARCH 28TH.

SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY, Bill to incorporate	659
MANITOBA ELECTION RETURNS, Question concerning (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)	659

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
[March 28]	
QUEBEC HARBOUR, Bill for improvement and management of (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>).....	660
BRITISH COLUMBIA, admission into Union with Canada, Debate on resolutions (<i>Hon. Sir. G. E. Cartier</i>)	660

SENATE, MARCH 29TH.

PETERBORO & OTTAWA RAILWAY, Petition concerning (<i>Hon. Mr. Shaw</i>)....	683
MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE, Petition from concerning amendments to Bill relating to weights and measures	683
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ST. JOHN N. B., Petition concerning Usury Laws.	682
PRIVATE BILLS, Time for receiving reports extended (<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>).....	683
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Question by (<i>Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just</i>).....	683
MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE ASSOCIATION, Bill to incorporate (<i>Hon. Mr. Allan</i>).....	683
HARBOUR DUES, Owen Sound Bill, 2nd reading (<i>Hon. Mr. MacPherson</i>)	683
MESSAGE FROM COMMONS, Transmitting Ontario Bank, and Ontario & Quebec Railroad Bills,	685

COMMONS, MARCH 29TH.

MANITOBA, Member for Selkirk introduced and seated,	686
SUPERNNAUATION ACT, Question concerning (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)	686
HALIFAX PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Concurrence in report of Committee of Supply [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]	686
COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY, House in Committee, motion of (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)	688
CANAL CONSTRUCTION, Debate upon	688
FREDERICTON & ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY, (Act passed through Committee)	692
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Debate resumed,	492

SENATE, MARCH 30TH.

PRIVATE BILLS, 6th Report of Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>].....	703
INTEREST, Enquiry [<i>Hon. Mr. Dever</i>].....	703
MESSAGE FROM COMMONS, announced by Speaker.....	704
FENIAN INVASION, Bill to indemnify members of Government, [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	705
HARBOUR DUES, Trenton, 2nd reading Bill [<i>Hon. Mr. Read</i>]	705
RAILWAY BRIDGES, exemption Bill, 2nd reading [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	708
ONTARIO BANK, Bill to amend charter 2nd reading [<i>Hon. Mr. MacPherson</i>] ..	709

COMMONS, MARCH 30TH.

RED RIVER EXPEDITION, return of vessels chartered [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>].....	710
MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND, Enquiry, [<i>Mr. Lapum</i>].....	710
LACHINE CANAL CULVERTS, motion for reports [<i>Mr. Ryan</i>].....	710
ORDERS IN COUNCIL, &c., motion for Printing [<i>Mr. Mills</i>]	710
S. J. DAWSON, motion for reports [<i>Mr. Macdonald, Glengarry</i>]	710
CUSTOMS DUTIES, reply to Mr. Holton's inquiry [<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>]..	710
INSOLVENT ACT, 1869, Bill to amend House in Committee [<i>Mr. Godin</i>]	710
SEAFORTH VILLAGE, Bill to annex withdrawn [<i>Mr. Cameron, Huron</i>]	711
ISOLATED RISK FIRE INSURANCE CO., Bill read a third time, passed	711
KINGSTON & PEMBROKE RAILWAY CO., " "	711
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Debate resumed... ..	711
Amendment [<i>Mr. Jones, Halifax</i>]	711
Division List, on Mr. Jones' Amendment	729
Amendment [<i>Mr. Ross, Dundas</i>]	730
Division List, Mr. Ross' amendment.. ..	730
Division List, on Mr. Mackenzie's amendment....	731

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[March 30]		
AMENDMENT [Hon. Mr. Dorion]		Page 731
DIVISION LIST, on Mr. Dorion's amendment		731
DIVISION LIST, on original motion		732
NOTICE OF AMENDMENTS, in Committee [Mr. Mackenzie]		733

SENATE MARCH 31st.

BOUCHETTE, JOSEPH, Memorial [Hon. Mr. Ryan]	733
MESSAGE FROM COMMONS, announced by Speaker	734
LIBRARY, Report of Committee [Hon. Mr. Campbell]	734
PRIVATE BILLS, Report of Committee [Hon. Mr. Sanborn]	734
PRINTING, Report of Joint Committee [Hon. Mr. Simpson]	734
HARBOUR DUES, OWEN SOUND, Order for 3rd reading [Hon. Mr. McPherson]	734
BRITISH COLUMBIA, Notice of resolutions [Hon. Mr. Campbell]	734
GEOLOGICAL REPORTS, Enquiry, [Hon. M. Dickey]	735
FALSE BAY BEACH, Enquiry, [Hon. Mr. Bourinot]	735
TRINITY HOUSE, QUEBEC, Bill respecting Office [Hon. Mr. Mitchell]	735
PRIVATE BILLS, Time for receiving extended [Hon. Mr. Sanborn]	735
MANITOBA, Motion, address to His Excellency [Hon. Mr. Bureau]	735
CURRENCY, Assimilation, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Campbell]	737
ONTARIO & QUEBEC RAILWAY CO., 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Skead]	739
FENIAN INVASION, House in Committee, Bill to indemnify	740

COMMONS, MARCH 31st.

CANAL COMMISSION, reply to enquiry [Hon. Mr. Langevin]	740
CUSTOMS ACT, House in Committee	740
COLLECTION OF REVENUE ACT, 2nd reading, amendment by Senate	740
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Morris]	740
METRIC SYSTEM, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Morris]	741
DOMINION NOTES, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	741
CRIMINAL LAWS MANITOBA, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	741
INSPECTION LAWS, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	741
INLAND REVENUE, MANITOBA, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Morris]	741
INDIAN LANDS, 2nd and 3rd reading Bill [Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier]	741
PORT WARDEN QUEBEC, House in Committee [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	742
BANK OF UPPER CANADA, House in Committee [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	742
NORTH WEST LOAN, House in Committee [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	742
FISHERIES, FOREIGN FISHING BILL, House in Committee [Hon. Dr. Tupper]	743
QUEBEC HARBOUR MANAGEMENT, 2nd reading Bill [Hon. Mr. Langevin]	743
ROCKWOOD ASYLUM, House in Committee [Hon. Mr. Morris]	744
INSURANCE COMPANIES, House in Committee [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	744
FREDERICTON & ST. MARY'S BRIDGE CO., 2nd and 3rd reading Bill	744
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, report of Committee [Hon. Sir Francis Hincks]	744
BRITISH COLUMBIA--Report of Committee (Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier)	744
Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie)	746
Division list, Mr. Mackenzie's amendment	752
Amendment (Mr. Cartwright)	753
Division list, Mr. Cartwright's amendment	753
Amendment (Mr. Bodwell)	753
do. (Mr. Killam)	754
Division list Mr. Killam's amendment	754
do. Mr. Bodwell's amendment	754
Amendment (Mr. Blake)	755
Division list, Mr. Blake's amendment	755
Address to Her Majesty--Committee to draft (Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier)	755
Address--1st reading	755

COMMONS, 1st APRIL.

DOMINION CONSTRUCTION CO--Bill to incorporate (Mr. Currier)	756
INSURANCE COMPANIES--2nd reading Bill (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks)	756

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
[April 1]	
BRITISH COLUMBIA--2nd reading address (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)	756
Amendment (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)	756
Division list on Mr. Mackenzie's amendment	762
Amendment (<i>Sir A. T. Galt</i>)	764
Division list on Sir A. T. Galt's amendment	764
ADDRESS passed and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)	765
GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY CO., 2nd and 3rd reading Bill	765
VAUDREUIL RAILWAY CO., 2nd and 3rd reading Bill	755
METROPOLITAN BANK, 2nd and 3rd reading Bill	765
WESTERN BANK, 2nd and 3rd reading Bill	765
MONTREAL WAREHOUSING CO.--Motion (<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>)	765
Division list, Mr. Holton's Motion	770
OFFICIAL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS (<i>Mr. Blake</i>)	770

SENATE, APRIL 3RD.

ONTARIO & QUEBEC RAILWAY--Bill--3rd reading	772
MONTREAL & OTTAWA JUNCTION RAILWAY--Bill 3rd reading	772
HARBOUR DUES, TRENTON--Bill ordered for 3rd reading	772
BRITISH COLUMBIA--Resolutions submitted (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)	772

COMMONS, APRIL 3RD.

PRINTING--Delay in Printing Bills (<i>Mr. Macdonald, Glengarry</i>)	815
PRIVATE BILLS--District of Bedford Bank--Bank of Liverpool, and Sun Insurance Company's amendment	817
Bills passed	817
PROROGATION--Statement concerning (<i>Hon. Sir George E. Cartier</i>)	817
MANITOBA--Collection of Revenue (<i>Hon. Mr. Tilley</i>)	818
IMPERIAL TROOPS--Address concerning withdrawal of (<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>)	819
BEAUFARNOIS CANAL, expenditure upon, motion for address concerning [<i>Mr. Masson, Soulanges</i>]	821
SOLDIERS Conduct of in North West, Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Masson, Soulanges</i>]	821
ORDERS IN COUNCIL, Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Mills</i>]	822
DEBATES, Publication of, Motion for employment of Stenographers [<i>Hon. Mr. Blanchet</i>]	823
Debate thereon	824
Division	826
CLAIM AGAINST GOVERNMENT, George Sterling, Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Currier</i>]	826
PRINTING, Adoption of 7th Report of Joint Committee [<i>Mr. Brousseau</i>]	827
INDIAN LANDS, Remarks concerning [<i>Mr. Mills</i>]	827
PATENT LAW, Bill to amend withdrawal [<i>Mr. Oliver</i>]	828
STERLING'S CLAIM, Reverted to [<i>Hon. Sir A. T. Galt</i>]	829
INSOLVENCY LAWS, Act to repeal, Motion for 2nd reading of Bill [<i>Mr. Colby</i>]	829
Debate thereon	830
Division List not carried	831
Bill ruled out of order	831
MARRIAGE--Mr. Bowell's Bill to remove doubts as to legality of certain Marriages discharged	832

SENATE, APRIL 4TH.

BRITISH COLUMBIA, Debate thereon opened by (<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>)	832
Debate adjourned	881

COMMONS, APRIL 4TH

PACIFIC RAILWAY, Motion for House in Committee on, on the morrow (<i>Hon. Sir. Geo. E. Cartier</i>)	881
---	-----

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[April 4]		
CUSTOMS DUTIES, Bill to amend, Motion for third reading (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		Page 881
Debate thereon		882
Division,		882
Division on Amendments		883
BANKING AND COMMERCE, Report of Committee, (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>).		885
RAILWAYS, CANALS, AND TELEGRAPHS, Report of Committee (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)		885
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, Interference of at elections (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)		885
Debate thereon		886
Division		899
SUPPLY, House in Committee,		899

SENATE, APRIL 5TH.

BRITISH COLUMBIA, Debate resumed		899
Division		935
ADDRESS MADE TO HER MAJESTY, Moved for (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)		935
THE ADDRESS REPORTED, (<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>)		935

COMMONS, APRIL 5TH.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE, Motion for House in Committee on (<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>)		942
MANITOBA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA, Bill to extend certain acts to these Provinces, (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)		942
NEW MEMBER. Mr. Delorme introduced		942
MESSAGE, from His Excellency, Supplementary Estimates		942
RAILWAY GAUGE, Consideration of resolution 95, Intercolonial Railway (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		942
Debate thereon.		943
Division		947
CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY, Bill to incorporate (<i>Dr. Grant</i>)		950
PRIVATE AND LOCAL BILL, Read a third time—Act respecting Commercial Bank of New Brunswick (<i>Hon. Mr. Tilley</i>)		950
Act to extend Act of late Province of Canada, concerning Synod of Church of England in Canada, to New Brunswick (<i>Hon. Mr. Tilley</i>)		950
Act to incorporate Mutual Life Association of Canada, (<i>Hon. Mr. cDougail, Lanark</i>)		950
Act to incorporate Kingston Board of Trade (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)		950
Act to incorporate Board of Trade of Town of Windsor, (<i>Mr. O'Connor</i>)		950
Act to amend acts respecting management and improvement of Quebec Harbour (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>)		950
Act to incorporate Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, (<i>Mr. Simpson</i>)		950
LISGAR, Dr. Schultz, member for—introduced		950
BANKS AND BANKING, Motion for House in Committee, (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		950
BILLS PASSED, Loan to pay certain sum to Hudson's Bay Co. (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		951
To amend Act respecting settlement of affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada, (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		951
Act to amend Act respecting fishing by Foreign vessels (<i>Hon. Dr. Tupper</i>).		951
SUPPLY, House moved into Committee of (<i>Hon. Sir Francis Hincks</i>)		951
Explanations		952

SENATE, APRIL 6TH.

BILLS PASSED		958
DUTIES ON CUSTOMS—Bill to amend, read first time		958
ISOLATED RISK INSURANCE COMPANY—Motion to report Bill back to Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Allan</i>].		958
PRIVATE BILLS—Time for receiving Reports extended [<i>Hon. Mr. Sanborn</i>].		958

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[April 6]	Page
BILLS FROM COMMONS—First reading of	958
BAY VERTE CANAL—Cost of Survey [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	958
FALSE BAY BEACH—Report of Enquiry [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	950
LIBRARY—Bill for regulation of [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	958
SESSION—Close of [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	958

COMMONS, APRIL 6TH.

LAKE ONTARIO—Light Houses on, question concerning [<i>Mr. Keeler</i>]	959
SENATORIAL ACT—Municipalities entitled to indemnity [<i>Mr. Pope</i>]	959
CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS—Liability to defray cost of correspondence concerning [<i>Mr. Savary</i>]	959
NORTH-WEST TERRITORY—Resolutions concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Macdougall</i>]	959
Debate thereon	961
ELECTION BILL—Motion concerning Lists of Electors [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	967
Debate thereon	968
Notice of Amendment [<i>Mr. Dorion</i>]	976
MILITIA ACT—Extension of to Manitoba and British Columbia [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	977
BILLS PASSED—Act to permit sale of Rockwood Asylum	977
Act respecting certain officers of Trinity House at Quebec	977
INLAND REVENUE—Reduction of Excise duty on Spirits manufactured from molasses in bond [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	977
LIBRARY—Salaries of Librarian and other officers and servants—House in Committee [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	977

SENATE, APRIL 8TH.

STATUE OF HER MAJESTY—Enquiry concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Odell</i>]	977
PENITENTIARIES—Report of the Director [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	978
INSOLVENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL	978
CUSTOMS DUTIES AMENDMENT BILL	978
CANAL COMMISSIONER'S REPORT [<i>Hon. Mr. Campbell</i>]	978
BILLS PASSED	978
MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE—Petition from [<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>]	978
BILLS PASSED	979

COMMONS, APRIL 8TH.

PROROGATION—Intended on Wednesday next [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	979
PROVENCER ELECTION—Mr. Speaker reads petition from Wm. Dease concerning	979
ELECTION BILL—Second reading of amendments in Committee moved [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	979
Debate thereon	980
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS—Question concerning opening of [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	989
BILLS PASSED—Act for appointment of Port Warden Harbour of Quebec	990
Act respecting Insurance Companies [as amended]	990

SENATE, APRIL 10TH.

JOURNAL OF HOUSE—That letter of Alfred Garneau, Esq., be expunged therefrom [<i>Hon. Mr. Seymour</i>]	990
CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE	990
COMMITTEE ON STANDING AND PRIVATE BILLS—Act to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company reported against	990
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT—Motion for an address to ascertain the number of persons on whom punishment had been inflicted [<i>Hon. Mr. Christie</i>]	990
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Report of Select Committee [<i>Hon. Mr. Wark</i>]	991
SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY—Motion for second reading of Bill to incorporate [<i>Hon. Mr. Macpherson</i>]	991

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
COMMONS, APRIL 10TH.	
NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY—Act to authorize agreements, for leasing lines of railway of other Companies passed.	992
MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER—Attention drawn to allegation that said member had been a member of Riel's Government [<i>Mr. Ross, Prince Edward</i>].	992
Debate thereon.	993
Division on Hon. Mr. Macdougall's motion, as amended by Hon. Mr. Dorion.	1001
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY—Motion for second reading of Bill to incorporate.	1001
Read a third time and passed.	1001
DOMINION TELEGRAPH COMPANY—Bill to incorporate passed (<i>Mr. Cameron, Peel</i>).	1001
RIEL—Whether extradition of had been demanded [<i>Mr. Whyte, East Hastings</i>].	1001
INSPECTION OF FISH—Address for correspondence concerning [<i>Mr. Fournier</i>].	1002
ADMISSION OF PROVINCES INTO UNION—Motion for certain resolutions to be recorded on the Journals of the House [<i>Mr. Mills</i>].	1002
MANITOBA—Military expedition to—Motion for correspondence concerning [<i>Mr. Masson, Soulanges</i>].	1002
STERLING'S CLAIM—Motion for a Select Committee on return of correspondence respecting [<i>Mr. Currier</i>].	1003
Division.	1004
INDIAN LANDS—Motion for address for correspondence in reference to public lands in Ontario, about which there was no treaty of reservation to Indians, prior to 1st July, 1867 [<i>Mr. Mills</i>].	1005
HOUSE EMPLOYEES—Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Burpee</i>].	1005
DEPARTMENTAL APPOINTMENTS—Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Burpee</i>].	1005
CLERGY RESERVES—Motion for address for statement of lands set apart as Clergy Reserves out of 27,857 acres surrendered by the Mohawk Indians in Township of Tyendinaga [<i>Mr. Bowell</i>].	1005
McGREEVY'S CLAIM—Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>].	1005
EVENING SESSION—Suggestion [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>].	1005
DR. DAW'S CLAIM, Motion for address concerning claim made by Dr. Daws for medical service rendered to late Private B., Sifton (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>).	1006
RAILWAY ACT, Bill to amend Act of 1868, &c., House moved into Committee, (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>).	1006
STAMP DUTIES, House in Committee on Bill for Act to remove doubts in certain cases.	1006
MANITOBA LANDS, Motion for address for amendment surveys &c. (<i>Hon. Mr. Mac Dougall</i>).	1007

SENATE, APRIL 11TH.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILROAD, Consideration of Report of Select Committee...	1008
Debate thereon,	1009

COMMONS, APRIL 11TH.

CENSUS, Question concerning means taken to secure accuracy in taking of (<i>Hon. Sir A. T. Galt</i>)....	1020
BILLS PASSED, For Act respecting certain Savings Banks in Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. For Act to provide facilities for deposit of Savings at interest with the security of Government, and for issue and redemption of Dominion Notes.	1020
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—House in Committee on Metric system of to be permissive.	1021
MANITOBA—Duties of Excise [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>].	1021
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT—Act to amend Act—motion concerning [<i>Mr. Blake</i>].	1022
Division thereon.	1022
OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT—Motion concerning [<i>Mr. Blake</i>].	1023
Division thereon.	1024

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
[April 11]	
NORTH WEST TERRITORIES—House in Committee on Act to make further provision for Government of (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>).	1025
CRIMINAL LAWS IN MANITOBA—House in Committee to extend Criminal Laws now in force in other Provinces of Dominion to Manitoba	1026
ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCES—House in Committee to consider certain resolutions for address to Her Majesty on draft of Bill for submission to Imperial Parliament, to remove doubts concerning powers of Parliament of Canada to establish Provinces in territories, admitted or to be admitted into the Dominion.	1027
PACIFIC RAILWAY—House in Committee to consider resolution concerning union of British Columbia with Canada, that the Pacific railway should be constructed and worked by private enterprise.	1027
Amendment by Hon. Mr. Dorion	1028
Division thereon	1029
Amendment by Mr. Tremblay	1029
Division thereon	1029
BANKS AND BANKING—Motion concerning second reading of amendments to (<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>)	1030
RAILWAY DRAWBRIDGES—Motion to exempt Railway Companies, in certain cases, from obligation of building drawbridges over navigable rivers (<i>Hon. Mr. Langevin</i>).	1030
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT—Second reading of Act in relation to.	1031
ESTIMATES—Explanations concerning (<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>)	1032
SCOTT MURDER—Motion regretting that steps had not been taken by Government to procure punishment of murderers of Thomas Scott	1036
Debate thereon	1037
Division	1049
SUPPLY—House in Committee—Supplementary estimates passed <i>pro forma</i>	1048

SENATE, APRIL 12TH.

MISCELLANEOUS—Certain Bills passed	1049
Verbal amendments to Election Bill in case of Nova Scotia [<i>Hon. Mr. Dickey</i>].	1049
Remarks concerning Printing for House	1050
BRITISH COLUMBIA—His Excellency Lord Lisgar's answer to address on subject of admission of British Columbia into union with Canada	1050

COMMONS, APRIL 12TH.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS—Question of Privilege—no provision made for trial of controverted elections in Manitoba (<i>Mr. Blake</i>)	1051
Amendment to Mr. Blake's motion (<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>)	1052
SUPPLY—Motion for reception of report of the Committee [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	1053
Debate on supplementary estimates	1054
Division on item for ordnance and equipment for field batteries and garrison batteries of artillery.	1058
Miscellaneous items to widows of persons killed or injured while in service of Government	1060
Compensation to sufferers by Rupert's Land insurrection.	1061
Debate thereon	1062
Statue of Her Majesty	1080
BILLS PASSED.	1081
POWER OF PARLIAMENT—Establishment of Provinces.	1081

SENATE, APRIL 13TH.

ROUTINE BUSINESS.	1082
---------------------------	------

COMMONS, APRIL 13TH.

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION—Question concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	1082
PACIFIC RAILWAY—Question concerning [<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>]	1082

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

<i>[April 13]</i>	<i>Page</i>
PERSONAL ATTACK—allusion to, and explanation [<i>Hon. Mr. Howe</i>]	1082
LANDS IN MANITOBA—withdrawal of motion concerning (<i>Hon. Mr. Macdougall</i>)	1085
NOTICE OF PROROGATION	1087
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS IN MANITOBA—Question [<i>Hon. Mr. Holton</i>]	1087
WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS—motion concerning [<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>]	1087
SUPPLY BILL	1088

COMMONS, APRIL 14TH.

TELEGRAM—From Sir John A. Macdonald [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	1089
REBELLION LOSSES IN MANITOBA—Explanation [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	1089
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS IN MANITOBA—Reply to Dr. Schultz [<i>Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier</i>]	1090
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—motion for concurrence in amendments made in Senate respecting metric or decimal system of [<i>Hon. Mr. Morris</i>]	1090
SUPPLY BILL—Third reading of [<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks</i>]	1090
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	1093

SENATE, APRIL 14th.

THE HIGH COMMISSION - Inquiry concerning [<i>Hon. Mr. Ryan</i>]	1093
MISCELLANEOUS	1093
PROROGATION	1093

THE SENATE.

ALPHABETICAL LIST of the Senators of the Dominion of Canada,
Fourth Session of the First Parliament, 1871. The Honourable
JOSEPH EDOUARD CAUCHON, Speaker.

<i>Senators.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
The Honourable	
<i>Aikins, James Cox</i>	Richview.
<i>Allan, George William</i>	Toronto.
<i>Anderson, John H.</i>	Halifax.
<i>Archibald, Thomas D.</i>	Sydney, C. B.
<i>Arnand, Joseph F.</i>	Rivière-des-Prairies.
<i>Benson, James Rae</i>	St. Catharines, Ontario.
<i>Bill, Caleb R.</i>	King's County.
<i>Blake, Oliver</i>	Waterford, Ontario.
<i>Botsford, Amos Edward</i>	Westcock, Westmoreland.
<i>Bourinot, John</i>	Sydney.
<i>Bureau, Jacques Olivier</i>	Montreal.
<i>Burnham, Asa Allworth</i>	Cobourg.
<i>Campbell Alexander</i>	Kingston.
<i>Cauchon, Joseph E.</i>	Quebec.
<i>Chaffers, William Henry</i>	St. Césaire.
<i>Chapais, Jean Charles</i>	St. Denis, Kamouraska.
<i>Christie, David</i>	Paris, Ontario.
<i>Cormier, Charles</i>	Plessisville.
<i>Dever, James</i>	St. John, N. B.
<i>Dickey, Robert B.</i>	Amherst.
<i>Dickson, Walter Hamilton</i>	Niagara.
<i>Duchesnay, A. Juchereau</i>	Ste. Catherine's, Fossambault.
<i>Duchesnay, Elzéar H.</i>	Ste. Marie, Beauce.
<i>Dumouchel, Léandre</i>	Ste. Thérèse de Blainville.
<i>Ferguson, John</i>	Bathurst.
<i>Ferrier, James</i>	Montreal.
<i>Flint, Billa</i>	Belleville.
<i>Foster, A. B.</i>	Waterloo.
<i>Glasier, John</i>	Sunbury, N. B.
<i>Guévrement, Jean Baptiste</i>	Sorel.
<i>Hamilton, John</i>	Kingston.
<i>Hamilton, John</i>	Hawkesbury.
<i>Hazen, Robert Leonard</i>	St. John, N. B.

SENATE.

ALPHABETICAL LIST of Senators of the Dominion, &c.—(Con.)

<i>Senators.</i>	<i>Senators.</i>
The Honourable	
<i>Holmes, John</i>	Pictou.
<i>Kenny, Edward</i>	Halifax.
<i>Lacoste, Louis</i>	Boucherville.
<i>Leonard, Elijah</i>	London.
<i>Leslie, James</i>	Montreal.
<i>Letellier de St. Just, Luc</i>	Rivière-Ouelle.
<i>Locke, John</i>	Shelburne.
<i>Macpherson, David Lewis</i>	Toronto.
<i>Macfarlane, Alexander</i>	Wallace, N. S.
<i>McClelan, Abner Reid</i>	Hopewell, Albert County.
<i>McCrae, Walter</i>	Chatham, Ontario.
<i>McDonald, Donald</i>	Toronto.
<i>McLelan, Archibald W</i>	Londonderry, N. S.
<i>McMaster, William</i>	Toronto.
<i>Mulhiot, Charles</i>	Point-du-Lac.
<i>Matheson, Roderick</i>	Perth.
<i>Miller, William</i>	Halifax.
<i>Mills, Samuel</i>	Hamilton.
<i>Mitchell, Peter</i>	Newcastle, Miramichi.
<i>Northup, Jeremiah</i>	Halifax.
<i>Odell, William Hunter</i>	Fredericton.
<i>Olivier, Louis A</i>	Berthier.
<i>Price, David Edward</i>	Chicoutimi.
<i>Reesor, David</i>	Markham.
<i>Renaud, Louis</i> . . .	Ste. Martine, Chateauguay.
<i>Robertson, John</i>	St. John, N. B.
<i>Ross, John</i>	Toronto.
<i>Ryan, Thomas</i>	Montreal.
<i>Sanborn, John Sewall</i>	Sherbrooke.
<i>Seymour, Benjamin</i>	Port Hope.
<i>Shaw, James</i>	Smith's Falls.
<i>Simpson, John</i>	Bowmanville.
<i>Skead, James</i>	Ottawa.
<i>Steeves, William Henry</i>	St. John, N. B.
<i>Tessier, Ulrich Joseph</i>	Quebec.
<i>Wark, David</i>	Richibucto.
<i>Wilmoit, Robert Duncan</i>	Belmont, Sunbury.
<i>Wilson, Charles</i> . . .	Montreal.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker—The Hon. JAMES COCKBURN. *Clerk*—W. B. LINDSAY, Esq.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

<i>Constituencies.</i>	<i>Members.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
Addington.....	<i>James N. Lapun</i>	Napanee.
Algoma.....	<i>W. M. Simpson</i>	Sault Ste. Marie.
Bothwell.....	<i>David Mills</i>	Bothwell.
Brant, N. R.....	<i>J. Y. Bown, M. D.</i>	Brantford.
“ S. R.....	<i>Hon. E. B. Wood</i>	“
Brockville, Town.....	<i>Jas. Crawford</i>	Brockville.
Bruce, N. R.....	<i>Alex. Sproat</i>	Southampton.
“ S. S.....	<i>Francis Hurdon</i>	Kincardine.
Cardwell.....	<i>T. R. Ferguson</i>	Cookstown.
Carleton.....	<i>J. Holmes</i>	Bell's Corners.
Cornwall, Town.....	<i>Hon. J. S. Macdonald</i>	Cornwall.
Dundas.....	<i>J. S. Ross</i>	Broquois.
Durham, E. R.....	<i>F. H. Burton</i>	Port Hope.
“ W. R.....	<i>Ed. Lake</i>	Toronto.
Elgin, E. R.....	<i>T. W. Dobbie</i>	Staffordville.
“ W. R.....	<i>J. H. Munroe</i>	Wardsville.
Essex.....	<i>J. O'Connor</i>	Windsor.
Frontenac.....	<i>T. Kirkpatrick</i>	Kingston.
Glengarry.....	<i>D. A. Macdonald</i>	Alexandria.
Grenville, S. R.....	<i>Walter Shanly</i>	Montreal.
Grey, N. R.....	<i>Geo. Snider</i>	Owen Sound.
“ S. R.....	<i>Geo. Jackson</i>	Bentinck.
Haldimand.....	<i>D. Thompson</i>	Indiana.
Halton.....	<i>John White</i>	Milton.
Hamilton, City.....	<i>Charles Magill</i>	Hamilton.
Hastings, N. R.....	<i>McKenzie Bowell</i>	Bellefille.
“ E. R.....	<i>John White</i>	“
“ W. R.....	<i>James Brown</i>	“
Huron, N. R.....	<i>Joseph Whitehead</i>	Clinton.
“ S. R.....	<i>M. C. Cameron</i>	Goderich.
Kent.....	<i>Rufus Stephenson</i>	Chatham.
Kingston, City.....	<i>Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, K.C.B.</i>	Ottawa.
Lambton.....	<i>Alex. Mackenzie</i>	Sarnia.
Lanark, N. R.....	<i>Hon. W. McDougall</i>	Ottawa.
“ S. R.....	<i>Alex. Morris</i>	Perth.
Leeds & Grenville, N. R.....	<i>Francis Jones</i>	Kemptville.
Leeds, S. R.....	<i>John Crawford</i>	Toronto.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—*Continued.*

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.—*Con.*

<i>Constituencies.</i>	<i>Members.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
Lennox.....	<i>R. J. Cartwright...</i>	Kingston.
Lincoln	<i>T. R. Merrit.....</i>	St. Catherines.
London, City	<i>Hon. John Carling.....</i>	London.
Middlesex, N. R.....	<i>Thos. Scatcherd.....</i>	"
" E. R.....	<i>Crowell Willson.....</i>	"
" W. R.....	<i>A. P. Macdonald.....</i>	Glencoe.
Monck.....	<i>L. McCallum.....</i>	Stromness.
Niagara, Town.....	<i>Angus Morrison.....</i>	Toronto.
Norfolk, N. R.....	<i>A. Walsh.....</i>	Simcoe.
" S. R.....	<i>P. Lawson.....</i>	Port Dover.
Northumberland, E. R.	<i>Joseph Keeler.....</i>	Colborne.
" W. R.....	<i>Hon. J. Cockburn.....</i>	Cobourg.
Ontario, N. R.....	<i>J. H. Thompson</i>	Cannington.
" S. R.....	<i>Thos. N. Gibbs.....</i>	Oshawa.
Ottawa, City.....	<i>Jos. M. Currier.....</i>	Ottawa.
Oxford, N. R.....	<i>T. Oliver</i>	Woodstock.
" S. R.....	<i>E. V. Bodwell.....</i>	Ingersoll.
Peel	<i>Hon. J. H. Cameron.....</i>	Toronto.
Perth, N. R.....	<i>J. Redford.....</i>	Stratford.
" S. R.....	<i>R. Macfarlane.....</i>	"
Peterboro', E. R.....	<i>P. M. Grover.....</i>	Norwood.
" W. R.....	<i>Chas. Perry.....</i>	Peterboro'.
Prescott	<i>Albert Hagar.....</i>	Plantagenet.
Prince Edward.....	<i>Walter Ross.....</i>	Picton.
Renfrew, N. R.....	<i>Hon. Sir F. Hincks.....</i>	Ottawa.
" S. R.....	<i>J. L. Macdougall.....</i>	
Russell.....	<i>J. A. Grant, M.D.....</i>	Ottawa.
Simcoe, N. R.....	<i>T. D. McConkey.....</i>	Barrie.
" S. R.....	<i>W. C. Little.....</i>	Allendale.
tormont	<i>Samuel Ault.....</i>	Aultsville.
Toronto, E.....	<i>James Beaty.....</i>	Toronto.
" W.....	<i>R. A. Harrison.....</i>	"
Victoria, N. R.....	<i>John Morison</i>	Woodville.
" S. R.....	<i>G. Kempt.....</i>	Lindsay.
Waterloo, N. R.....	<i>I. E. Bowman.....</i>	St. Jacob's
" S. R.....	<i>J. Young.....</i>	Galt.
Welland	<i>T. C. Street.....</i>	Chippewa.
Wellington, N. R.....	<i>G. A. Drew.....</i>	Elora.
" S. R.....	<i>D. Stirton.....</i>	Guelph.
" C. R.....	<i>Jas. A. Ross.....</i>	Cumnock.
Wentworth, N. R.....	<i>J. McMonies.....</i>	Waterdown.
" S. R.....	<i>Joseph Rymal.....</i>	Barton.
York, E. R.....	<i>James Metcalf.....</i>	Toronto.
" N. R.....	<i>James P. Wells.....</i>	King.
" W. R.....	<i>Amos Wright.....</i>	Richmondville

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Continued.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

<i>Constituencies.</i>	<i>Members.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
Argenteuil	<i>Hon. J. J. C. Abbott.....</i>	Montreal.
Bagot	<i>P. S. Gendron.....</i>	St. Rosalie.
Beauce	<i>C. H. Pozer.....</i>	Quebec.
Beauharnois.....	<i>M. Cayley.....</i>	Beauharnois.
Bellechasse.....	<i>T. Fournier.....</i>	Quebec.
Berthier.....	<i>A. H. Paquet.....</i>	St. Cuthbert.
Bonaventure.....	<i>T. Robitaille.....</i>	New Carlisle.
Brome.....	<i>Hon. C. Dunkin.....</i>	Knowlton.
Chambly.....	<i>B. Benoit.....</i>	St. Hubert.
Champlain	<i>Hon. J. J. Ross.....</i>	St. Ann de la Péraade.
Charlevoix.....	<i>S. X. Cimon.....</i>	Malbaie.
Chateauguay.....	<i>Hon. L. H. Holton.....</i>	Montreal.
Chicoutimi&Saguenay	<i>P. A. Tremblay.....</i>	Chicoutimi.
Compton	<i>J. H. Pope.....</i>	Cookshire.
Dorchester	<i>Hon. H. L. Langevin, C.B.</i>	Quebec.
Drummond & Arthabaska.....	<i>L. A. Senecal.....</i>	Pierreville.
Gaspé.....	<i>P. Fortin.....</i>	Quebec.
Hochelaga.....	<i>Hon. A. A. Dorion.....</i>	Montreal.
Huntingdon.....	<i>J. Scriver.....</i>	Hemmingford.
Iberville.....	<i>Francois Bechard.....</i>	Iberville.
Jac. Cartier.....	<i>G. G. Gaucher.....</i>	Ste. Geneviève.
Joliette	<i>F. B. Godin.....</i>	Joliette.
Kamouraska	<i>C. A. P. Pelletier.....</i>	Quebec.
Laprairie	<i>A. Pinsonneault.....</i>	Laprairie.
L'Assomption	<i>Hon. L. Archambault.....</i>	L'Assomption.
Laval.....	<i>J. H. Bellerose.....</i>	St. Vincent de Paul
Levis	<i>Hon. J. G. Blanchet.....</i>	Levis
L'Islet.....	<i>B. Pouliot.....</i>	L'Islet.
Lotbiniere	<i>H. G. Joly.....</i>	Quebec.
Maskinonge.....	<i>G. Caron</i>	St. Léon.
Megantic	<i>Hon. Geo. Irvine.....</i>	Quebec.
Missisquoi.....	<i>Geo. B. Baker.....</i>	Cowansville.
Montcalm.....	<i>Jos. Dufresne</i>	St. Julienne.
Montmagny.....	<i>Hon. J. O. Beaubien.....</i>	Montmagny.
Montmorency.....	<i>J. Langlois.....</i>	Quebec.
Montreal Centre.....	<i>Thos. Workman.....</i>	Montreal.
“ East.....	<i>Hon. Sir George E. Cartier, Bart.....</i>	“
“ West.....	<i>M. P. Ryan.....</i>	“
Napierville.....	<i>Sixte Coupal.....</i>	Lacolle.
Nicolet	<i>Jos. Gaudet.....</i>	Gentile.
Ottawa Co.....	<i>A. Wright.....</i>	Ironside, Hull.
Pontiac.....	<i>Ed. Heath.....</i>	Portage du Fort.
Portneuf.....	<i>J. Brousseau.....</i>	Quebec.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—*Continued.*

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.—*Con.*

<i>Constituencies.</i>	<i>Members.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
Quebec Centre.....	<i>G. H. Simard</i>	Quebec.
“ East.....	<i>Adolphe Tourangeau</i>	“
“ West.....	<i>Hon. T. McGreevy</i>	“
“ County.....	“ <i>P. J. O. Chauveau</i> ...	“
Richmond & Wolfe....	<i>W. H. Webb</i>	Melbourne.
Richelieu.....	<i>J. J. Barthe</i>	Sorel.
Rimouski.....	<i>Geo. Sylvain</i>	Bic.
Rouville.....	<i>G. Cheval</i>	St. Hilaire.
St. Hyacinthe.....	<i>Louis Delorme</i>	St. Hyacinthe.
St. Johns.....	<i>F. Bourassa</i>	Lacadie.
St. Maurice.....	<i>Dr. Lacerte</i>	Yamachiche.
Shefford.....	<i>Hon. L. S. Huntington</i> ...	Waterloo
Sherbrooke.....	<i>Hon. A. T. Galt</i>	Sherbrooke.
Soulanges.....	<i>L. H. Masson</i>	Coteau Landing.
Stanstead.....	<i>Chas. Colby</i>	Stanstead.
Temiscouata.....	<i>Chas. A. Bertrand</i>	Isle Verte.
Terrebonne.....	<i>L. F. R. Masson</i>	Terrebonne.
Three Rivers.....	<i>Alex. McDougall</i>	Three Rivers.
Two Mountains.....	<i>J. B. Daoust</i>	St. Eustache.
Vaudreuil.....	<i>D. McMillan</i>	Rigaud.
Vercheres.....	<i>F. Geoffrion</i>	Vercheres.
Yamaska.....	<i>Moise Fortier</i>	St. David.

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Albert.....	<i>John Wallace</i>	Hillsboro’.
Carleton.....	<i>Hon. C. Connell</i>	Woodstock.
Charlotte.....	<i>John Bolton</i>	St. Stephen.
Gloucester.....	<i>Hon. T. Anglin</i>	St. John.
Kent.....	<i>A. Renaud</i>	Buctouche.
Kings.....	<i>Geo. Ryan</i>	Studholm, King’s Co.
Northumberland.....	<i>R. Hutchison</i>	Newcastle.
Queens.....	<i>J. Ferris</i>	Cambridge.
Restigouche.....	<i>Geo. Moffatt</i>	Dalhousie, N. B.
St. John, County.....	<i>Hon. J. H. Gray</i>	Ottawa.
“ City.....	“ <i>S. L. Tilley</i> ,.....	“
Sunbury.....	<i>Chas. Burpee</i>	Sheffield.
Victoria.....	<i>J. Costigan</i>	Grand Falls.
Westmoreland.....	<i>Hon. A. J. Smith</i>	Dorchester.
York.....	“ <i>J. Pickard</i>	Fredericton.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—*Continued.*

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

<i>Constituencies.</i>	<i>Members.</i>	<i>Post Office Address.</i>
Annapolis.....	<i>W. H. Ray</i>	Clemensport.
Antigonish.....	<i>Hugh McDonald</i>	Antigonish.
Cape Breton.....	<i>Hon. J. McKeagney</i>	Sydney.
Colchester.....	<i>Fred. N. Pearson</i>	Truro, N. S.
Cumberland.....	<i>Hon. C. Tupper</i>	Halifax.
Digby	<i>A. W. Savary</i>	Digby.
Guysboro	<i>Hon. S. Campbell</i>	Guysboro'.
Halifax.....	<i>A. Jones</i>	Halifax.
“	<i>P. Power</i>	“
Hants.....	<i>Hon. Jos. Howe</i>	“
Inverness	<i>H. Cameron</i>	Mabou.
Kings	<i>W. H. Chipman</i>	Cornwallis.
Lunenburg	<i>E. M. McDonald</i>	Halifax.
Picton	<i>J. W. Carmichael</i>	New Glasgow.
Queens.....	<i>James F. Forbes</i>	Liverpool.
Richmond	<i>J. Levisconte</i>	Halifax.
Shelburne.....	<i>Thos. Coffin</i>	Shelburne.
Victoria.....	<i>Wm. Ross</i>	St. Anne's.
Yarmouth	<i>Frank Killam</i>	Yarmouth.
MANITOBA.		
Provencher.....	<i>Pierre Delorme</i>	St. Norbert.
Winnipeg	<i>John Schultz</i>	Winnipeg.
Selkirk	<i>D. A. Smith</i>	Hudson's Bay House, Montreal.

DOMINION PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

IN THE

*FOURTH SESSION OF THE FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION
OF CANADA WHICH WAS CALLED TO MEET, FOR THE DESPATCH
OF BUSINESS, ON WEDNESDAY, THE 15TH FEBRUARY, A. D.,
1871, IN THE 34TH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HER MAJESTY
QUEEN VICTORIA.*

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LORD LISGAR,

GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

THE SENATE.

OTTAWA, FEBRUARY, 15th, 1871.

This day, at three o'clock P. M., His Excellency the Governor General proceeded in state to the Chamber of the Senate, in the Parliament Buildings, and took his seat upon the Throne. The members of the Senate being assembled, His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being present, His Excellency was pleased to open the Fourth Session of the First Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, with the following Speech from the Throne :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I have much satisfaction in meeting you at this, the usual and most convenient season of the year, and under the present auspicious circumstances of the country.

The hope I was sanguine enough to express at the close of the last Session, that no further attempt would be made to disturb our frontier was doomed to early disappointment. The Session had scarcely closed when lawless bands assembled within the United States in great numbers, and renewed the menace of invasion.

They ventured to cross the border at two points, but were promptly met and repelled. So complete and humiliating was the repulse, that the invaders lost heart and hope, threw away quantities of arms, and fell back to encumber the villages in their rear, with their starving and demoralized masses.

Our Militia rallied at the first call to arms with praiseworthy alacrity, and the spirit which pervades the country, swelled their numbers with volunteers from all quarters.

The gallantry displayed and the success achieved, have been duly recognized by the highest Military authority, and honoured, in gratifying terms of appreciation, by Her Most Gracious Majesty. In maintaining the militia on active duty, the Government incurred an outlay to a considerable amount beyond what was provided by the votes of last Session. The accounts of their entire expenditure for the defence of the frontier will be laid before you, and I feel confident that you will pass a Bill to indemnify the Government.

My anticipations of success in regard to the Act passed for the Government of Manitoba, and the North West Territories, and in regard to the Military Expedition, which it was necessary to despatch, have been fortunately realized.

The troops surmounted the difficulties of the long and toilsome route with endurance and intelligence. They encountered no armed opposition, and their arrival at the Red River was cordially welcomed by the inhabitants.

The people of the new Province have, under the Constitution accorded to them last year, assumed all the duties of self-government, and every appearance warrants the hope that they are entering steadily upon a career of peace and prosperity.

The Legislature of British Columbia has passed an address to Her Majesty, praying for admission into the Union, on the terms and conditions therein stated. All the papers on this important subject will be submitted, and your earnest attention is invited to them, I hope you will think that the terms are so fair as to justify you in passing a similar Address, so that the boundaries of Canada may, at an early day, be extended from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean on the one side, to the shores of the Pacific on the other.

Should such an address be adopted, it will be necessary for you to take steps to secure the early exploration and survey of a route for an Inter-oceanic Railway, with a view to its construction in accordance with the terms of Union.

The acquisition of the North West Territories throws upon the Government and Parliament of the Dominion the duty of promoting their early settlement by the encouragement of immigration. This duty can be best discharged by a liberal land policy, and by opening up communications through our own Country to Manitoba. The means proposed for accomplishing these purposes will be submitted for your consideration.

Her Majesty's Government has decided upon referring the Fishery question, along with other questions pending between the two Countries, to a Joint Commission to be named by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States. On this Commission Canada will be represented. This mode of dealing with the various matters in controversy will, I trust, lead to their satisfactory adjustment. Canada urges no demand beyond those to which she is plainly entitled by Treaty and the law of nations. She has pushed no claim to an extreme assertion, and only sought to maintain the rights of her own people fairly and firmly, but in a friendly and considerate spirit and with all due respect to foreign powers and international obligations. The thanks of the Country are due to the Admiral on the Station and those under his command, for the valuable and efficient aid which they rendered to our Cruisers during the past Season in maintaining order and protecting the in-shore Fisheries from encroachment.

The prospect of the adoption of an International Currency seems, in the present state of Europe, to be so remote, that I recommend you to consider the propriety of assimilating the Currency of the Dominion without further delay.

The extension to Manitoba of the Militia and other Laws of the Dominion, and their adaptation to the present circumstances of that young Province, will require your attention.

The decennial Census will be taken on the third day of April next, and it is believed that a more thorough and accurate system has been adopted than any that has hitherto obtained. It may be necessary to amend the Act of last Session in some particulars.

Among other measures Bills will be presented to you relating to Parliamentary Elections, Weights and Measures, Insurance Companies, Savings Banks, and for the consolidation and amendment of the Inspection Laws.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have given directions that the Public Accounts shall be laid before you.

You will learn with satisfaction that the Revenue for the past year was in excess of what was estimated, and that the prospects for the current year are so encouraging that, notwithstanding the extensive public improvements which are contemplated, you will probably be able to diminish the taxation of the country.

The Estimates for the ensuing year will be submitted to you, and I feel assured that you will be of opinion that the supplies which you will be asked to vote can be granted without inconvenience to the people.

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate; and
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I lay these various and weighty matters before you in full confidence that they will engage your mature attention, and I pray that the result of your deliberations may, with the Divine blessing, prove conducive in all respects to the advancement and happiness of the Country.

HIS EXCELLENCY having retired, the Speaker took the chair.

Robert Lemoine, Esq., took his place in due form as Clerk of the Senate.

Hon. Messrs. MACFARLANE, NORTH-UP and PERRY were sworn in as members of the Senate.

A Bill was introduced *pro formâ*, and some other business transacted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, seconded by the Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, it was resolved to take into consideration the speech of His Excellency on Friday next.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 15.

At 3:40 p.m. the members of the House of Commons returned from the Senate Chamber, and the Speaker, having taken the chair, read over the following list of members who had been removed from the House since last session:

Mr. CALDWELL (Restigouche), deceased.

Mr. CASAULT (Bellechasse), appointed Judge of the Superior Court.

Mr. B. CHAMBERLIN (Missisquoi), appointed Queen's Printer.

Mr. HUOT (Quebec E.), appointed Postmaster of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. KIERZKOWSKI (St. Hyacinthe), deceased.

Mr. McCARTHY (Richelieu), deceased.

Hon. Mr. ARCHIBALD (Colchester) appointed Lieut.-Governor of Manitoba.

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings, N. S.), deceased.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following new members were introduced:

Mr. MOFFATT (Restigouche), introduced by Hon. Mr. Tilley and Dr. Fortin.

Mr. TOURANGEAU (Quebec, E.), introduced by Hon. Mr. Langevin and Mr. Simard.

Mr. DELORME (St. Hyacinthe), introduced by Hon. Mr. Holton and Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings, N. S.), introduced by Dr. FORBES and Mr. ROSS.

Mr. BARTHE (Richelieu), introduced by Mr. BEAUBIEN and Dr. FORTIN.

Hon. C. TUPPER (Cumberland), introduced by Hon. Mr. HOWE and Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Hon. member took his seat next to Hon. Mr. DUNKIN, and behind Hon. Mr. TILLEY, amid applause.

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

The SPEAKER presented a copy of His Excellency's speech to the House.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that it be taken into consideration to-morrow—Carried.

The usual formal motions respecting the printing of the votes and proceedings, the appointing of the select committees, &c., were read and carried.

THE FISHERIES.

On the motion for adjournment,

Mr. MACKENZIE asked if it was the intention of the Government to bring down any correspondence regarding the fisheries before the discussion on the address of His Excellency to-morrow. It was desirable on so important a matter, if there was any correspondence relative to the appointment of the present Commission that the House should have it before them. As it was quite impossible for them to avoid discussing it during the debate to-morrow. It was a matter of far too much importance to this country, looking at it simply as one respecting our national rights, that the House should pass dumbly over this portion of His Excellency's speech without discussing, to some extent, at least, the questions that everyone could see were in-

volved in it. The Commission, for anything they might know to the contrary, might adopt some course that this Parliament might not think consistent with the national interests in this Dominion; and it was desirable that, at the earliest possible moment some expression of the opinion of public men in the country should be had on it. He took it for granted that the correspondence would be brought down.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was not the intention of the Government to bring down any correspondence or any papers of any kind before the answer to the address was carried. It was an unusual course and an exceedingly inconvenient one that the hon. member proposed. Care would be taken that the address to be moved should not commit any member of this House to the approval of the policy of the Government on that or any other question. The Government would, so soon as the House should address itself to business, bring down such portion of the correspondence relating to the fisheries as could be so produced without injury to the public interests. His hon. friend must know that it was a subject, under the present circumstances, to be very carefully handled, and he had no doubt that on a matter of so great importance the Government would receive every consideration at the hands of the honourable members opposite. They would, as they had done on other similar occasions, aid the Government, and avoid any course which might by any possibility prejudice the interests of the country, so soon as the address was answered, the papers asked for would be brought down.

Mr. MACKENZIE was aware that the general usage was as stated by his hon. friend, but there had been exceptions to it, and on very important questions like this, a departure from the custom might be admitted. He thought it unnecessary for the Hon. Premier to call on his supporters to aid him.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD appealed to his hon. friend opposite, and not to his supporters. He said that on a matter of national interest we might expect a favorable consideration from the hon. members opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he must have misunderstood his honourable friend, and he would not make the remarks that he had intended. The Government could always count on the patriotic assistance of the Opposition on matters of such importance.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that the returns on this question brought down last year, *Mr. Mackenzie.*

were very short and he would be glad that his hon. friend would see that the returns this year were more complete—as much so as was compatible with the public interests.

The House then adjourned at 4.05

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 16th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

THE DECEASED SENATORS.

After the usual routine proceedings,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said: It is only proper that I should draw attention to the losses that the House has sustained since we last met in this Chamber. Some of these losses have occurred in consequence of the retirement of gentlemen from the body, but others, I regret to say, from a more solemn cause. Since the close of the last session, we have lost Mr. Crawford, Mr. Ross and Mr. Anderson. As respects the latter, I cannot say as much as I can with reference to the other gentlemen, for I have only known him since 1867; but I am quite sure there are members belonging to Nova Scotia, who will bear full testimony to his worth and kindly qualities, which were so evident to all with whom he came into contact.

As respects my old and firm friends, Mr. Crawford and Mr. Ross, I wish I could say all that I desire with reference to the warm feelings of attachment that I entertain for both of them. Mr. Crawford has been gathered to his fathers, after a long life and useful career in this country. In his case death was not unexpected; he died full of years and honours, surrounded by everything calculated to soothe his parting hours. He had been in political life for many years, and a more true, loyal adherent to his political principles I had never the honour of knowing. Those who may have known him for over twenty years will bear ample testimony to his earnest and loyal spirit of friendship—to his adherence to his personal and political friends on every occasion. His last appearance in this House, I well remember, for it was in answer to an earnest request that he should come here and assist us with his support at a moment when we very much desired it. He came at a time when his health was enfeebled, but I am much relieved from the responsibility of having asked him to come here at that time, when I know that it had no injurious effect upon him, and that he was

much gratified in being able to discharge his duty to his political friends. I am quite sure that all the gentlemen who were acquainted with him will join me in the statement that it was impossible to have known a firmer adherent to political principles than was the late Mr. Crawford. In private life, he was a kind friend under all circumstances—genial, straightforward and sincere.

To my kind friend, Mr. Ross, I was attached by still closer ties, which were first formed in early youth, and have lasted to the hour of his death. His part in the political affairs of Canada has not been insignificant, for he entered into public life at an early age. He was summoned to the Legislative Council of the late Province of Canada in 1848,—then in the thirty-first year of his age—and some years later was appointed Solicitor General in the Baldwin-Lafontaine Administration. Subsequently he was Attorney General for Upper Canada, and Speaker of the Legislative Council. In 1858, he joined the Government of the day, and accepted the office of Receiver General, and still later the Presidency of the Executive Council, uniting with it the duties of Minister of Agriculture and Statistics. His aptness for official life was well illustrated by the readiness with which he adapted himself to the duties of the various offices he filled. Those who have only known him since the Union cannot appreciate his strong determination and his political experience and tact, as well as others who were acquainted with him for a longer term of years. Few men were better able to instruct us in constitutional principles than he was. Like Mr. Crawford he was unswerving in his political alliances, and always anxious to do good for his country, but whilst unwavering in his opinions, he could make allowance for those who conscientiously differed from him. It is needless I should detail at length the many services he performed for the country in the course of his political career. Well do I remember his part in the settlement of a question which long agitated this country, namely, the Clergy Reserves. It was owing very much to his exertions in England—particularly to his determination of character and his thorough comprehension of the question—that the bill was passed through Parliament, which enabled us to deal with that question. On that occasion, he had many powerful influences to contend against. Men of high position in Ontario were exercising their influence in England—in the House of Lords and in the Commons; he nevertheless succeeded in achieving his object. We also know the great interest

he took in the Grand Trunk Railway, and the ability and perseverance with which he managed its affairs when connected with the management of that important work in its inception. But these are mere items in the long list of his useful public services. I would fain say more, but as I speak, my feelings overpower me, and I must ask the House to excuse me from adding more at present.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.—I will add very little to what has been said by the Hon. Postmaster General. I feel that he sincerely regrets the loss of Mr. Ross and Mr. Crawford. Although I cannot go as far as the hon. member in speaking of their political services, yet I know that they were both just and honest in purpose, and for this reason I entertain a high respect for their memories. I have known Mr. Ross for a long period of time; I have been an intimate friend of his; I have also known Mr. Crawford, and both of them were eminently generous in their public and private relations. We have always had that respect for each other which gentlemen of this house should feel. With the Postmaster General I deplore their loss, and pay this tribute of respect to their memories. I would say more, but I am speaking in a language not as familiar as the one in which I generally speak; but what I am now saying concerning the loss of these gentlemen is the sincere expression of my regrets. As respects Mr. Anderson, I cannot help feeling that his sudden decease must have been materially hastened by the sad loss of his son last winter in the ill-fated "City of Boston." I will not say more, but will simply add that we should not fail to keep sacred the memories of the men who have left us.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—As reference has been made to a deceased Nova Scotian Senator, it would be certainly unbecoming in me and contrary to my feelings were I to remain silent on this occasion. As respects Mr. Anderson, I may claim not only to have had his personal friendship but to have been politically connected with him, since we were both members of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia. It is true for the greater part of that time we were not politically allied, but I am on that account a still more impartial witness of his straightforward integrity of character. With regard to his deportment in this body you are as well able as myself to judge. I can speak of him, during the time of my acquaintance with him, as a man of integrity, and of strong adherence to principle. As a legislator he brought to the councils of his country a very great amount of

commercial knowledge, and on that account especially, we have suffered a loss which we cannot easily replace. With respect to Mr. Ross, my acquaintance dates so long back as some thirteen years ago—at the time when we were co-delegates to the Colonial Office, and then I formed an opinion of that honourable gentleman, which I never since changed. It would be a waste of words to add anything to what the Postmaster General has said. On public grounds we have sustained a great loss, for Mr. Ross brought to the consideration of public business an admirable tact and a wonderful fund of knowledge of public matters and of constitutional law. We, who have been endeavouring to mould our institutions into form, know full well how useful are the services of such a man as the one whose loss we now deplore. I must also pay my tribute of respect to the straightforward demeanour of Mr. Crawford. It is only necessary to mention his name here, to evoke a universal testimony to his worth. On these grounds, I must add this feeble tribute to the memories of the gentlemen who have left us, and if it be in accordance with the practice of the House, I would like to see a resolution passed unanimously to adjourn the Senate for a few hours in recognition of the loss we have sustained.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, seconded by Hon. Mr. DICKEY, it was then resolved that the House do adjourn out of respect to the gentlemen whose decease they all so deeply deplored.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, Feb. 16.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:15 p.m.

Mr. MCGILL presented the first report of the Hochelaga Election Committee.

THE MANITOBA REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for information regarding the representation from the Province of Manitoba. By the Act of last session four members were to be elected as representatives of that Province to seats in the House. No Information had been received concerning the issue of the writs for those elections, or whether the elections had taken place, or whether that Province was to remain unrepresented during the present session. It had been

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

agreed that the Bill as passed in that relation was wholly unconstitutional, and opposed to the Federal system, under which we politically exist, and if he recollected aright, the Hon. Premier admitted last session that it might be necessary to apply to the Imperial Parliament to execute the provisions of that Bill—in other words to give them legal force as the law of the land. He (Mr. MacKenzie) thought the House was entitled to know what steps had been taken as regarded this matter, for it was generally admitted by gentlemen well informed on the subject, that the House had exceeded its powers.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD quite recognised the right of the honourable gentleman to ask the question, and he would try to answer it, although it might have been more satisfactory to have waited the submission of the papers on the subject. Perhaps the papers would have answered the question themselves. The first duty imposed upon the Lieutenant Governor of the new Province of Manitoba was the completion of a census of the people with all convenient speed. That census was undertaken and finished in a manner which the papers would show was satisfactory and above all suspicion of error. The moment the census was taken, the Lieutenant-Governor reported to His Excellency the Governor General the result of the census and the divisions into which, for electoral purposes, the New Province had been made. On the receipt of that despatch, without further delay, writs had been issued and sent up to Manitoba, and the Government expected to hear every moment the result of those elections, *quoad* the members returned to this House. As regards the question of the legality of the seats of those gentlemen, or of the representative system provided in the Manitoba Act of last session, the question was, he thought, first raised by the hon. member for Halton. In his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) reply to that question, he stated there was in his opinion a doubt as to the appointments to the Senate, and perhaps as to some other clauses of the Bill, and that they would be carefully considered; and that if it was thought on maturer consideration there was any doubt as to the constitutionality of those provisions, steps would be taken to secure their "constitutionalization," if he could use such a word, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. On his return to Ottawa, after an absence of some months, he examined the case carefully, and made a report upon it, which was made the basis of an order in Council, which was transmitted by His Excellency to the Secretary of State in England. They had received in return the

draft of a Bill for the purpose of confirming that Act and all the proceedings under it, and also making all provision for the future, with which he would not now trouble the House. As regarded the other provisions, they might be dealt with so as to settle once for all the affairs of the Province. He trusted the settlement or arrangements effected could be transmitted to England by the next mail, with the object of submission to the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked if it was the intention of the Government not to nominate the Senators for Manitoba till this Bill passed the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said his hon. friend ought to give notice of that question.

Mr. MACKENZIE thought not. The people were represented in the other House as well as in this. Had the Government appointed the Manitoba Senators?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was the intention of the Government that Manitoba should be represented in both branches of the Legislature during the present session. It would be an anomaly to have the people represented in one House and not in another. Perhaps by concert with the hon. gentlemen opposite it might be arranged, so that without raising any question of constitutionality the representatives of Manitoba might be allowed to take their places in the other House also, pending the receipt of the Bill from England.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that would be a matter for consideration.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. FOURNIER, the member for the County of Bellechasse, was introduced and conducted to his seat by Mr. Geoffrion and the Hon. Mr. Dorion; and

Mr. GEO. T. BAKER, the newly elect member for Missisquoi, was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Dunkin and Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

QUESTION REFERRING TO FISHERIES.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT wished to know if the Government proposed to proceed with the debate on the address at once. He had given special consideration to the American question referred to in His Excellency's speech, and holding the opinion he did on the subject, it might be his duty to move for some expression of the House concerning it. The time was so short between the

present moment, and that when the Commission would sit, that if any expression of the opinion of this House could have effect upon the action of the Commission, he thought it was necessary that it should be given at an early day. He did not see how it could be done at any other time than during the debate on the Address. It was quite true that there would be an embarrassment felt in the absence of the correspondence asked for yesterday by the hon. member opposite, but he trusted that that embarrassment would be greatly relieved by the explanations which, he had no doubt, the hon. gentlemen in the Government would make. He might say with regard to one branch of that correspondence, he thought the Government were in a position to give it to the House before going on with the debates. He referred to that which had taken place before last year. On the 9th of March last year, copies of correspondence relating to the protection of the fisheries was asked for. On the 9th of May, he found, on the reference to the journals of the House, the hon. minister of militia had brought down a short despatch from Earl Granville to the effect that a portion of the fleet in the North American waters would be detailed for the purpose of protecting the fisheries. The despatch was very short—only some four lines. The House was told that there was other correspondence which would be brought down without delay. It was not laid before the House, however, and had not appeared during the recess. Now, he thought if that correspondence were laid before the House it would put them in possession of the facts, at any rate up to the period previous to the recent apparent change of policy on the part of the Imperial Government on this question. He hoped the Government would see that the House was placed in possession of the correspondence, believing, as he did, that it was his duty to call attention more particularly to the circumstances attending the appointment of the Joint Commission which had been announced. The question involved in the debate was of such gravity, and was related so closely to the most important interests of this country, that he thought it would be very improper, he might say, to permit almost the only chance the House would have to express their opinion on the subject to pass without giving full consideration to it. He thought that there was no particular object in detaining the House at this moment.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said with regard to the copies of the Address, they

would be laid before the House in a very short time. He would repeat to his hon. friend from Sherbrooke what he had said yesterday, that the reply would be so framed that this House would not be asked to commit themselves to the policy of the Government. Of course they were in the hands of the House with respect to going on with the debate to-day or having it postponed. The discussion on the Address had now become merely formal in England, and an amendment was never moved except in the way of a vote of want of confidence. In fact, no matter what information the House might obtain by papers being laid on the table, they and the country at large would receive from the discussion expressions altogether unsatisfactory. While the Government were thankful to the hon. member for Sherbrooke for his kind notice as to his intentions with respect to this matter, it was a question whether his motion would not receive more justice at the hands of the House and at his own hands if it were a substantial motion on the Orders of the Day. Those papers that the Government could with any propriety, and without decided injury to the public interests, furnish, would be laid on the table without delay, and then, of course, his hon. friend could have every opportunity to discuss the matter. If the House wished to postpone the debate till to-morrow the Government would do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE quite concurred in the desire expressed by the honourable member for Sherbrooke respecting the correspondence relative to the fisheries. He (Mr. Mackenzie) asked for it yesterday, believing that in a matter of such grave importance to our national existence, it was exceedingly desirous, almost necessary he might say, that the House should discuss the debate on the speech of His Excellency. The Government refused his request, though why he did not see, for the honourable Premier intimated his intention to bring it down after the debate on the address. If anything should constitute an exception, this case should. With regard to the general question of proceeding with the debate, he would say that unless the correspondence asked for were brought down there was no necessity for delay.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON believed that this House should follow as closely as possible the practice of the Imperial House of Commons. In that body the debate on the Queen's speech lately took place on the same day that it was delivered. If he were disposed to find any fault with the Government it would be because they did not proceed with the debate on His Ex-

cency's address yesterday. Seeing that the Hon. Minister of Justice refused to bring down the papers in advance of the discussion, there could be no good reason why the discussion should not proceed at once, (applause).

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that if he was to understand the Premier would afford him an opportunity after the papers were brought down, of obtaining the opinion of this House on the points he desired to bring before it, he would not stand in the way of the address.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—Certainly.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT reminded the hon. gentlemen there was always a difficulty in making a substantive motion, sometimes it was got rid of by moving the previous question. He did not intend his motion should be so disposed of. He was perfectly prepared to let the matter stand over; but there were considerations higher than mere parliamentary convenience, and among them was the obtainment of the opinion of this House in reference to the important matters to be dealt with by the approaching International Commission. The Hon. Premier was soon to leave for Washington. No discussion of the fishery or other questions, to come before the Commission, would be of the slightest advantage if it were to follow the departure of the leader of the Government. He thought it was their bounden duty to strengthen the hands of their representative on that Commission by every means in their power. He proposed to do so by a resolution. If the Government promised him an early opportunity of doing so—say Monday or Tuesday, he would not stand in the way of the immediate passage of the address.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD promised the early opportunity solicited. He quite recognised the importance of these subjects, and the propriety of the discussion before he left for Washington.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

Mr. LACERTE rose to propose the address in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. Taking up the various paragraphs, he spoke briefly and happily on each, as usual, expressing concurrence in the different views therein set forth, and complimenting the Government on its administrative policy. He referred particularly to the Fenian enterprise of last spring, and the wise and vigorous efforts put forth for its overthrow. He hoped the House would fully sustain the Administration in this matter by voting the additional expenditure it was compelled to incur.

Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald.

He was glad at the prospect of the settlement of the fishery dispute, and believed everything would be done to protect Canada's interests. Fortunately the Red River trouble was ended, thanks to the judicious and conciliatory action of the Government, and to the exertions and bravery of the Volunteers. The Dominion was in a prosperous condition, largely owing to the wisdom of Ministers, who deserved the confidence of Parliament and the people. (Cheers.) He had much pleasure in moving the Address.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK rose to second the motion. The topics of the speech well deserved the compliments paid them. Scarcely had the Parliament been prorogued last summer when hordes of miscreants from the United States suddenly assembled on our frontier to pillage and ravage our land. To add to the infamy and offensiveness of this outrage, those marauders chose for the time of their unwarranted operations, the day above all, dear to loyal British subjects, the Queen's birth day. The hostile movement was, thanks to the bravery and loyalty of our volunteers and the troops of the Queen, hurled back in disgrace from our border. He hoped and doubted not the House would cheerfully vote the extra expenses entailed by this attempted Fenian invasion, (hear, hear.) The next subject in the speech was that of Manitoba. No better Governor could have been chosen than him who is now *de facto*, if not *de jure* in power. The improvements already witnessed in Manitoba prove the judiciousness of the efforts made to suppress disorder and rebellion, and set up the authority of Canada. The brave Volunteers who had been instrumental in securing those happy results, deserved the thanks of the country. When disbanded he believed they were entitled to grants of land in Manitoba. No better settlers could be chosen, and in justice to them, and in the interests of the Province, everything should be done to retain them in the North West. (Cheers.) The proposed admission of British Columbia and Van Couver Island was a subject of satisfaction to us all. The great scheme of Confederation was being rapidly consummated. Those great territories, so rich in natural resources, would be a great acquisition to Canada, and everything possible should be done to unite them to her by a Pacific Railway, grants of land, and, if possible, pecuniary contributions, should be made in aid of such enterprises. There is little doubt that in this way they could be achieved. Emigrants were necessary to the development of the great resources of the Pacific colonies, and good, rapid communications were indispensable to the at-

traction of immigration. The next subject of the Speech was the Fisheries, and it was but truth to say that the action of the Canadian Government in regard to them had met with the approbation of the whole country. The reference of Gen. Grant to the action of Canada exhibited both ignorance and prejudice. The Dominion had but acted within its right, and it was certain that action was justified by the approval of the Government of England also. However, a Joint Commission had been appointed to consider the Fishery question and that relating to events connected with the last war, and from it he thought Canada had nothing to fear. He hoped, however, that the injury done to Canada by repeated Fenian raids would form one of the subjects discussed, and that indemnity for our losses thereby would be as rigorously required as was indemnity for the losses from the "Alabama." The improvement of our coinage system and other proposals of the speech would be cordially received. The interests of the country demanded such ameliorations. The general administration of the affairs of the Dominion had been beneficial, as its progress and prosperity amply testified (cheers.) He could but concur in the closing aspiration of the Speech from the Throne, upon which the future happiness and advancement of Canada would largely depend (cheers).

Mr. MACKENZIE said that it was important in opening the grand inquest of the nation, that they should review the administration of affairs and foreign events, while abstaining from unusual criticism. Stupendous events had taken place since the last session, including those of a gigantic and disastrous war. It was but right he should express his sympathy with the sacrifices and sufferings of that great nation, being the friend and ally of England. He did hope that France would not suffer much either in feeling or interest in the forthcoming treaty of peace (hear, hear). Coming to the position of Canada, it was but right her relations towards the United States should receive attention. President Grant had spoken of it as a semi-independent position, and there was truth in this view of it. Doubtless it was on this account that we had been continually and systematically subjected to offensive remarks and ill-judged acts of administration from the people of the United States. The inhabitants of this country had reason for complaint on this head, but were not willing to submit to ill will or aversion with the object of forcing them from their present constitutional position. That policy he for one repudiated in the strongest possible terms, and he announced his strongest opposition to yielding any of

our rights to an arrogant demand from them, (hear, hear). If we were to maintain an independent position on this continent we must cultivate that natural love of liberty which prevailed in our midst, and maintain our natural rights intact. It was for this reason he desired to have the correspondence relating to this question brought down. He desired to know whether an attempt had been made by the Imperial Government to force negotiations upon us, with an object naturally hostile to our rights. The honourable member who seconded the address expressed a hope that the matter of the Fenian movement would be brought down before the Joint Commission. If it were to be discussed by them, he saw no indication of it. He had read all the information he could find relating to it, and no mention of our claims appeared in it. If it were so, the British Minister at Washington was much to blame. Nothing could be more arrogant and ridiculous than the claims put forward by the President of the United States to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence. The instances referred to by the President were all cases which were settled by treaty. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was disposed to giving all facilities to the commerce of our neighbors, but he was not disposed to concede to them as a right what was manifestly an unjust claim. With regard to the fishery question, he believed that it was an unwise concession to give up for a moment our claim to the headland boundary line. He was not able to congratulate the House on the condition of affairs in Manitoba. If he were asked to congratulate them that the men who had rebelled against the Government of Canada were the very ones who had received offices and held power, that loyal men had been rigorously excluded from places of trust, and that the murderers of poor Scott were still at large, he might congratulate the House. He was not in favour of punishing the poor dupes of a few designing men, but he believed that the men who had been guilty of stirring up rebellion and executing an innocent man should not be allowed to go free of punishment. He would simply recall the past to say that these men should receive the punishment they deserved, and to say that the men who had been loyal to Canada should not be excluded from places of honor and trust. He would now refer to the recent additions which had been made to the Cabinet. The hon. member for Cumberland had gone before his constituents and made some remarkable statements to them. He (Mr. Mackenzie) held in his hand a copy of the speech referred to, and he would just read a portion of it

to the House. It would be noticed that the hon. gentleman with characteristic modesty had spoken of his own great services to the government, and to the country at large. [Here Mr. Mackenzie read an extract from the speech, commenting on it humorously amid the laughter of the House.] The hon. member for Cumberland had boasted that he had secured an increase of his following. That he brought with him fifteen members to the support of the Government. He congratulated the hon. member on his increasing influence. He was pleased also to notice the friendship which had grown up between his hon. friend and the hon. member for Hants. Times had changed since the two hon. members were opposed to each other. He (Mr. Mackenzie) made these statements in order that the speech of the hon. member from Cumberland should receive the publicity it deserved. The Ministerial journals seemed to have slighted the honourable member in this matter. None of them published it. It was true the Ottawa Times in a short paragraph had remarked that it was too important to be passed over without notice. The speech, it was evident was never intended to circulate outside of Cumberland. After referring to the course which the Government pursued towards the hon. member for North Lanark, Mr. Mackenzie spoke at some length on the subject of the Intercolonial Railway, and the causes which led to the ultimate choice of the Northern route. The honourable member for North Lanark had given a very full explanation in his pamphlet, recently published, of this matter. (Here Mr. Mackenzie read an extract from the pamphlet referring to it). While he (Mr. Mackenzie) looked with regret at the great loss to the country caused by the choice of the Northern Route, he was not sure that the Dominion had not derived some gain since certain members of the Government had been induced to acquiesce in the acquisition of the North-West Territory. He spoke at some length of the Fenian raid of last spring. He could not believe that the United States Government had exercised all their influence to prevent that raid. During last year, in Utah the Mormons organized a militia force and commenced to drill them openly. They were at once put down by the State authorities. Now, he contended that the municipal authorities on the frontier, if they had been disposed to deal with Canada in a friendly spirit, might have treated the Fenians in a similar manner. If they possessed the power in the one case, they certainly did in the other. The Government at Washington had certainly acted in the most

Mr. Mackenzie.

prompt and friendly manner as soon as representations were made to them by the Canadian authorities. In conclusion he would say that every member should recognize constituted authority and, in everything that related to the welfare of the country, the Government should have the earnest and cordial support of the Opposition. On the other hand, he should lose no opportunity, as he was bound to do in his position in the House, to point out the grievous results of the legislation of the present administration on the interests of the country (cheers).

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for Lambton in his anxiety to fill up his half-hours speech, as leader of the Opposition found it necessary to take up the election speech of the hon. member for Cumberland and criticize it. If the hon. gentleman had had anything in his mind that he thought he could bring out against the Government he would have done so; but the hon. gentleman was as mild as he possibly could be, and although the administrative policy of the Government was so disastrous, and although it was the duty of the hon. member to protest against that disastrous policy, yet he had not condescended to notice the facts he condemned, but he told them instead that there had been a series of extraordinary statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland, and that to secure his return to this House, the hon. member had been obliged to bring up these statements. The Government considered this and he (Sir John A.) accepted it as the judgment of his hon. friend in favor of the Government (laughter). He could not as a consistent member of the Opposition approve of their course, and he could not condemn them, and so was silent (renewed laughter). The hon. member admitted that the House had met in a season of prosperity, and under prosperous circumstances. It was true, the hon. gentleman remarked that it was so, but then, it was owing to the exertions of the people themselves, and in no degree attributable to the administration of the Government. He (Sir John A.) would admit that it was so, and the Government congratulated themselves that Providence smiled on them while they were in power, and that they had a comfortable majority of the people's representatives with them. He agreed with the hon. member that we all should feel sympathy for the ancient ally of England in her troubles; but he could not agree with the hon. member that this was the day of her greatest humiliation. There never was a time in the history of France when her future appeared brighter. She would rise renovated by her great trial to her old place, and be one of the first

powers of Europe, if she ever ceased to occupy that position; and he had no doubt that England and France would again and again act in concert as the foremost nations of modern civilization. (Hear, hear). With reference to the remarks of the hon. member respecting the fishery question, he would inform him that the Government were fully aware of their responsibility, and they were pleased to observe that their course in recent events had met with general approval throughout the country; and he would tell the hon. member that he need be under no apprehension, although he had expressed it, that England, our old Mother Land, would ever act the part the hon. member apprehended—to sacrifice our interests for the sake of any advantage to herself, or any desire to settle any question between the United States and herself. That was not the course that Mother England and the people of England would pursue. If any Government in England could sacrifice our interests for their own advantage, the people of England would reject them with scorn. He could assure his hon. friend that he would find that England was now, as she had always been, a fostering mother, careful of our interests and rights, and ready as she had always shown herself in the past, to protect us with all her force and might and power. (Applause.) He would not make any remarks respecting the observations of his hon. friend on the Fenian invasion, and about the claims which Canada of right had in consequence of the outrages upon our border, and the losses and expenses brought upon our people by those invasions. The hon. member would find that in this, too, the Canadian Government had taken every step necessary to press our claims to a conclusion. He could only assure his hon. friend that if they were not settled it would not be the fault of this Government. He would not enter into a discussion of the matter just at present, as they had already arranged on the papers that this subject should be taken up hereafter. His hon. friend had said that he would not join in the congratulations on the state of peace existing in Manitoba. He (Sir John A.) thought that it was a matter of congratulation to every well-ordered mind to see peace, quiet, rule and law brought into a country where all these had been absent (hear, hear). He thought it was a greater matter of congratulation that the accession of that country to the Dominion of Canada had not been made at the sacrifice of a single drop of blood; that the march of the soldiers, both regular and militia, was a peaceable one; that the only difficulties were those offered by the wildness

of the country through which they proceeded; and that they were received, as the House had hoped they would be, as friends, brothers, fellow-citizens, persons whose advent would be welcomed, and not persons to be feared. It was a matter of great consolation that there had been no blood-shed in the acquisition of the North West, and that although mistakes had been made, yet those errors led to no serious consequence, except, perhaps, the expenditure of a little money. The Union had been finally accomplished, and ere long the representatives from Manitoba would take their seats in this House. Granting all that had been said as to the mismanagement of the Canadian Government in consummating the union, to be correct, still it was a matter of congratulation that the union had taken place in harmony and peace, without the loss of one single life in the attempt to effect that union. The hon. member had remarked that he could not enter into congratulations that the murderers of a Canadian subject should have escaped justice. The hon. member was not asked for such congratulations. The Red River country was a British country at the time the crime was committed, although British law was for the time suspended. But British law and institutions existed there, and by the consent and voice of the people of Canada and their Parliament the people of the North West had now got a Legislature and Government of their own, on whom were thrown the responsibility of the administration of the laws, and on whom was also thrown the establishment of courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and the protection of the life, liberty and property of the people, and the punishment of offenders against them. He would ask his hon. friend why he had introduced this subject, or why he spoke of it all? Would he point out in what mode the Government of Canada, or the tribunals, or the constituted authorities of Canada could in any way have prevented the act? The hon. member knew that until the 15th of July last, when the act of Union was consummated, the North West was in no way connected with Canada except as a portion of the British Empire. Canada could no more have interfered in Manitoba than in any other colony of Great Britain. Canada had no control, no power, no authority. It was simply this, so long as that colony had its own Government, they were responsible for the protection of life and property, and for the administration of justice; and when that power was overthrown it was for Her Majesty only, in her Imperial capacity and with the Imperial authority in the tri-

bunals of Great Britain, to bring any offenders to justice. The moment that the Province became united with the Dominion it had a local Government of its own, and on that local Government, by the act of this Parliament, was thrown the obligation of punishing offenders. The people of Manitoba must be left as free people to manage their own institutions and protect their own people. He did not see that his hon. friend was at all justified in obtruding this discussion on the House during this debate. It was their duty, instead of trying to arouse man against man, and to keep alive such matters, to throw oil on the troubled waters and suppress hostile feelings, which were natural enough, but much to be deplored. He believed the laws would be fairly administered in Manitoba, and that life and property would be held just as sacred and safe there as they were in the older and larger Province of Ontario. His hon. friend had spoken of the Intercolonial Railway, and promised that at an early day he would bring up that subject. Having promised so much he (Sir John A.) would make another promise. He would promise that his hon. friend's statements, whatever they might be, if they were against the action of the Government or any subordinate engaged on the line, that there would be a full, complete and satisfactory answer—if not satisfactory to his hon. friend, at least satisfactory to this House and to the country (hear hear). He would make no reply to the remarks of his hon. friend, respecting the hon. member for Lanark. At the proper time, there would be a frank and free discussion of all that he had alluded to. He must protest against the course of the hon. member for Lambton, with respect to a friend of his in this House. The hon. gentleman had mentioned a rumor reflecting on that gentleman. It was easy to get up a rumor. It might be done by inserting a paragraph in a newspaper, and many had been so created in order to give an hon. member an opportunity to say he saw such and such in a certain paper. There should be no quotation of rumors in this House, respecting the character or conduct of persons in public life. The British system should be followed—that no member of Parliament shall make statements that he cannot verify or does not honestly believe to be strictly true (cheers).

The House rose for recess at 6:10 P.M.

AFTER RECESS.

The debate on the address was resumed. Dr. BOWN said that the Government deserved censure for the manner in which affairs had been managed in Manitoba since the organization of that Province. Loyal

Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald.

men had been allowed to go unrewarded, while those who had imprisoned and shot loyal men had been appointed to places of honor and trust. The conciliation policy pursued by the Lieutenant Governor was favourable to men who had acted in opposition to law, and compassion to such men was the greatest cruelty that could be inflicted on those who had stood up for Canada in her time of need. The Lieutenant Governor had early shown where his sympathies lay by going to reside in the Hudson Bay Company's Fort and receiving hospitality there. It was evident from the manner in which he had acted in the matter of Scott's death and in other circumstances, that his mind had been biased in favor of the late rebel party. As to the elections which had been held in the new Province, seven or eight of the candidates who had been elected, had been introduced from the Quebec Province. It might be said that Lieut.-Governor Archibald had nothing to do with this, but, if so, why did he permit three of these men to take places in his cabinet? As to the death of Mr. Scott, it would be far better to let it rest than that there should be a mere mockery of a trial. He hoped the Government would open up a road to the North West without delay, and that they would make up the losses which loyal men had incurred in the new Province during the late rebellion.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) agreed with the hon. Premier that the Government had no jurisdiction in the matter of the murder of Mr. Scott. It should not be forgotten, however, that no less than six counties in Manitoba had offered to return Riel as their representative. He referred to the relations existing between the Mother Country and the colonies, and said there was an uncertainty in the minds of the people, since the withdrawal of the troops, whether Britain proposed to sever the connection with Canada or not. Some even supposed that she would look to the colonies for help in time of trouble, instead of the latter looking to the former under circumstances of difficulty. We should learn from the Government whether the withdrawal of the troops indicates England's desire to get rid of us, and whether, since we have formed a Confederation, we shall be expected to help her in the time of her need. The Minister of Militia ought to enlighten the House on this important subject before the Militia estimates are brought down, (hear, hear).

Mr. MILLS also spoke on the paragraph of the address relating to Manitoba. He said the Federal system made it necessary

that each Province should have an independent governmental existence. Such could not be given to any Province by this Parliament. He had called attention to this fact last year, and was glad the Minister of Justice had changed his views in this respect (hear hear). As to the murder of Scott, it was still competent for the Government of Canada to authorise the trial and punishment of Riel, and it was also within the power of the Lieutenant-Governor to ask for his extradition.

The second paragraph of the address was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. DORION, on the proposal of the adoption of the paragraph relating to the admission of British Columbia, protested that he knew nothing of the merits of the terms of this admission, and declared his unwillingness to express blindfold any concurrence in the Government's Pacific Railway scheme. If it was to be one of the character of the Intercolonial Railway, he would give it his strenuous opposition. He could not approve of the wording of the paragraph.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD consented to a verbal alteration to meet the objection of the last speaker. The change was of a non-committal character, and thus modified, the clause was adopted.

The remaining paragraphs were read and concurred in without debate.

After the usual formal resolutions in regard to the address and its presentation,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD gave notice of an address of congratulation to Lord Lisgar on the distinguished honor recently conferred upon him by Her Majesty.

The House adjourned at a quarter past nine.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, Feb. 17, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock, and the ordinary routine business was transacted.

THE ANSWER TO THE SPEECH.

Hon. Mr. MacFARLANE said that he had much gratification in rising to move the Address in answer to the Speech, for he believed that the language of that Speech commended itself to the sound sense and judgment of the people of the Dominion. He had not the honour, last session, of a seat in the House, but he well remembered the excitement that existed everywhere, on account of the rebellion which had broken out at Red River, and threatened for a while the peace of the Dominion. The

policy pursued by the Government had happily settled what was likely to be a great difficulty at one time; and we had now the satisfaction of knowing that peace and order prevailed throughout our new Province of Manitoba, and that we would soon see its representatives in Parliament prepared to take their share in the legislation of our common country. Another matter mentioned in the speech was the raid upon an unoffending people by bands of Fenian marauders. All recollected the excitement that arose from one end of the country to the other, and the promptness with which our volunteers sprung to meet and repel the invader. Although the volunteers in the distant Maritime Provinces were unable to aid their fellow subjects of Ontario and Quebec on that occasion, yet they sympathized most heartily with their brave efforts, and would gladly have responded to any call that might have been made upon their services. (Hear, hear.) Now the House met under very different circumstances compared with those at the close of the last Session. No alarm of invasion was sounded, but peace reigned from one end of the Confederation to the other. The people of Manitoba were organizing their Government, and preparing to assist in the maturing of such measures as would promote their own prosperity and at the same time strengthen the ties that bind them to Canada. Then the House was informed by His Excellency that British Columbia was asking for admission into the Dominion, and that our Territory would soon stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific shores. The only portions of British America that now remained outside of the Confederation were the Islands of Prince Edward and Newfoundland, but he trusted that they would soon see the necessity of uniting their fortunes with their sister Colonies. He was convinced, indeed, that the people of Prince Edward Island were already beginning to understand the mistake they were making in remaining outside of the Union. One of the questions in which the Maritime Provinces took the deepest interest was that respecting the fisheries. It was impossible to discuss the question at that stage, when the papers were not before the House, but he could say that there was a conviction everywhere in Canada that the Commission which had been appointed would be able to arrive at results which would meet with the approval of Canadians. It was with great pleasure that he found that Canada was represented in the Commission by an able statesman, who would have to come before Parliament, and explain fully the

Hon. Mr. MacFarlane.

arrangements that might be made. He hoped that those arrangements would lead to an amicable adjustment of all the vexatious questions before the Commission ere many months passed away. As respects the Census, there was a universal desire that it should be as perfect as possible, in order that the resources of the Dominion might be shown to compare favourably with those of far older countries. He had no doubt himself that the Dominion would be proved to be making steady progress, equal to, if not greater than that of the adjacent States. Reference was also made to the assimilation of the Currency; and though, as a Nova Scotian, he felt a good deal attached to the Currency in use in that Province, still he was prepared to consider the whole question in a fair and impartial spirit. He would, of course, prefer to see the Nova Scotia currency adopted, but, nevertheless, if he and his friends were obliged to yield their wishes, it would only afford another illustration of the self sacrificing spirit of Nova Scotians (laughter). The last and most gratifying portion of the speech to many persons would be the announcement that the Government were able to meet Parliament with a largely increased surplus revenue, notwithstanding the heavy expenditures they were necessarily obliged to meet. No more gratifying statement could be made to the friends of Confederation, who had always combated the alarmists when they asserted that the scheme of Union would only tend to increase the burthens of the country. The people had now experience of the working of the Confederation for several years, and no one could say that it had failed to meet the expectations of those who had been its promoters and advocates through good and evil report. With such facts before the House, they had indeed a cause for gratification; and the country no doubt would fully appreciate the efforts of those who had been instrumental in bringing about such satisfactory results. Much more might be said on the subject, but he felt it was unnecessary at that time, and he would, therefore, content himself with moving the following answer to the speech, with which His Excellency had been pleased to open the Session:

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; to offer the respectful thanks of this House to His Excellency, for the gracious speech which His Excellency has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament, namely:—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable John, Baron Lisgar, of Lisgar and Bail-

ieborough, in the County of Cavan, Ireland, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and a Baronet, one of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor General of Canada, and Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Prince Edward.

May it please Your Excellency :

We, Her Majesty's loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, respectfully thank Your Excellency for your gracious speech at the opening of this Session.

We thank Your Excellency for the expression of your satisfaction in meeting us at this, the usual and most convenient season of the year, and under the present auspicious circumstances of the country.

We regret to learn from your Excellency that the hope Your Excellency was sanguine enough to express at the close of the last Session, that no further attempt would be made to disturb our frontier, was doomed to early disappointment; that the Session had scarcely closed when lawless bands assembled within the United States in great numbers, and renewed the menace of invasion; and that they ventured to cross the border at two points.

It gives us great satisfaction, however, to be informed by Your Excellency that the invaders were promptly met and repelled; that so complete and humiliating was the repulse, that they lost heart and hope, threw away quantities of arms, and fell back to encumber the villages in their rear, with their starving and demoralized masses; that our Militia rallied at the first call to arms with praiseworthy alacrity, and the spirit which pervades the country, swelled their numbers with volunteers from all quarters; and that the gallantry displayed and the success achieved, have been duly recognized by the highest Military authority, and honoured, in gratifying terms of appreciation, by Her Most Gracious Majesty.

Your Excellency having been pleased to state that in maintaining the Militia on active duty, the Government incurred an outlay to a considerable amount beyond what was provided by the votes of last Session, and that the accounts of the entire expenditure for the defence of the frontier will be laid before us; we beg leave to assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to any Bill to indemnify the Government which Your Excellency may cause to be laid before us.

We rejoice to hear from Your Excellency that your anticipations of success in regard to the Act passed for the Government of Manitoba, and the North West Territories, and in regard to the Military Expedition, which it was necessary to despatch, have been fortunately realised; that the troops surmounted the difficulties of the long and toilsome route with endurance and intelligence; that they encountered no armed opposition, and their arrival at the Red River was cordially welcomed by the inhabitants; that the people of the new Province have, under the Constitution accorded to them last year, assumed all the duties of self-government, and that every appearance warrants the hope that they are entering steadily upon a career of peace and prosperity.

We thank Your Excellency for informing us that the Legislature of British Columbia has passed an Address to Her Majesty, praying for admission into the Union, on the terms and conditions therein stated; and we beg to assure your Excellency that our earnest attention will be given to the papers on this important subject, which your Excellency is pleased to say will be submitted to us; and it will give us great pleasure to find the terms so fair as to justify us in passing a similar Address, so that the boundaries of Canada may, at an early day, be extended from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean on the one side, to the shores of the Pacific on the other.

Should such an address be adopted, we will give our best consideration to the question of taking steps to secure the early exploration and survey of a route for an Inter-oceanic Railway, with a view to its construction in accordance with the terms of Union.

We agree with your Excellency that the acquisition of the North West Territories throws upon the Government and Parliament of the Dominion the duty of promoting their early settlement by the encouragement of immigration; and that this duty can be best discharged by a liberal land policy, and by opening up communications through our own country to Manitoba. The means proposed for accomplishing these purposes, when submitted to us, will receive our attentive consideration.

We thank your Excellency for informing us that Her Majesty's Government has decided upon referring the Fishery question, along with other questions pending between the two countries, to a Joint Commission, to be named by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States, and that on this Commission, Canada will be represented; and with your Excellency, we trust that this mode of dealing with the various

matters in controversy, will lead to their satisfactory adjustment. Canada, as your Excellency states, urges no demand beyond those to which she is plainly entitled by treaty and the law of nations; and we rejoice to learn that she has pushed no claim to an extreme assertion, and only sought to maintain the rights of her own people fairly and firmly, but in a friendly and considerate spirit, and with all due respect to foreign powers and international obligations.

We cordially agree with your Excellency, in saying that the thanks of the Country are due to the Admiral on the Station and those under his command, for the valuable and efficient aid which they rendered to our Cruisers, during the past Season, in maintaining order and protecting the in-shore Fisheries from encroachment.

We agree with your Excellency in opinion that the prospect of the adoption of an International Currency seems, in the present state of Europe to be remote, and we thank your Excellency for recommending us to consider the propriety of assimilating the Currency of the Dominion without further delay.

We beg leave to assure your Excellency, that any measures which may be submitted to us for the extension to Manitoba of the Militia and other Laws of the Dominion, and their adaptation to the present circumstances of that young Province, will receive our best attention.

We thank your Excellency for informing us that the decennial Census will be taken on the third day of April next; that it is believed that a more thorough and accurate system has been adopted than any that has hitherto obtained, and that it may be necessary to amend the Act of last Session in some particulars.

We shall not fail to give an earnest and attentive consideration to the Bills relating to Parliamentary Elections, Weights and Measures, Insurance Companies, Savings Banks, and for the consolidation and amendment of Inspection Laws, which your Excellency is pleased to inform us will, among other measures, be presented to us.

We are grateful to your Excellency for the assurance that you lay these various and weighty matters before us in full confidence that they will engage our mature attention; and we unite with your Excellency in praying that the result of our deliberations may, with the Divine blessing, prove conducive in all respects to the advancement and happiness of the country.

Hon. Mr. ARMAND felt grateful for the honour conferred upon him in inviting him

Hon. Mr. MacFarlane.

to second the resolution for an Address under the present auspicious circumstances. Thanks to a kind Providence and to the liberal laws which govern us, the country enjoyed peace and prosperity. But this prosperity would increase, if the Government and people united in encouraging all attempts made to open up direct communication between the various sections and parts of the Dominion. He was happy to know that such attempts were now being made. Enterprising men, men of large capital, either individually or by forming societies, had seen the immense advantages to be derived by the country from such important works. Railroads were now being constructed in various parts of the Dominion, but he hoped that the Government would unite with those enterprising men he was alluding to. He then referred to the necessity of constructing the Georgian Bay and Ottawa Canal, by means of which the whole of the Western trade could be carried, thus opening to navigation and agriculture, the immense and fertile valley which lies between the Bay and the Ottawa District. The hon. gentleman then referred to the state of our Militia and said that the loyalty and patriotism displayed by the Volunteers were a source of pride to Canada—the alacrity with which they rallied at the first call to arms, and the gallantry which they displayed in action were gratifying to our national honour,—they nobly performed their duty, and deserved the praise and gratitude of the whole Dominion. Referring to the annexation of the North-West, he attributed the success achieved by the peaceful settlement of that question, to the liberal policy adopted during the last session, with regard to the treatment of the inhabitants of that Territory. By the annexation of the North-West, the limits of the Dominion of Canada extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, being the largest Territory possessed by any nation on the face of the earth with the exception of Russia. The hon. gentleman then praised the action of the Government in bringing in measures for the assimilation of the Currency of the Dominion, and for the regulating of weights and measures, and for the consolidation and amendment of the Inspection laws. These measures, if adopted, would no doubt be a great benefit to the country. He (Mr. Armand) would not close his remarks without referring to the friendly relations which should exist between the different national elements which compose the population of this great Dominion; if all nationalities, French, English, Scotch and Irish remained united, then there was nothing to be dreaded for the future pros-

perity of the country. Many might have political opinions differing from their neighbours, but all should be united on one question, that is, in the upholding of the honour of our country, and in endeavouring by every possible means to promote its interests. Speaking of the appointment of the Anglo-American High Commission, in view of the settlement of the questions and troubles arising from the fisheries, he sincerely trusted and felt convinced that the joint efforts of the distinguished men who composed that Commission, would establish an everlasting peace between the two countries, and prove conducive to the advancement and prosperity of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that he did not agree with the gentlemen who had just spoken in their lavish encomiums of the subject matter of the speech, yet he could heartily join them in congratulating the country on the successful repulse of the Fenian invaders last summer. The Volunteers certainly deserved all the credit they received in so promptly answering the call of duty. It would be remembered also, that on that occasion the regular troops took an active part in assisting the militia to drive the marauding bands from our soil, and our thanks were due to them as well as to our own people. It was, however, very significant that since that time, the British regulars had been withdrawn from this country and the defence of Canada virtually left in the hands of her own people. Now he was among those who entertained the opinion that when the Government met the House during the present Session their first duty was to inform the country of the reason of this withdrawal, and not leave everybody entirely in the dark. It was but due to the people of the Dominion that they should know the intentions of the British Government in relation to the future defence of the Dominion—whether we should have to quell rebellions and repel invasions without aid from the parent State. In his opinion this speech was as remarkable for its omissions as for its enunciations of policy. Certain questions were completely ignored.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—You would not have the speech longer?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—How was it that there was no reference to the improvement of the Inland Navigation of the Dominion? It was well known that the question of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the connection between the Gulf and the Bay of Fundy, was one of great interest to the people of the Dominion, and that it had been referred to a number of gentlemen; but

still it was not considered worthy of even an incidental mention in the Speech. Had the Government a policy on the subject or had they not? If they had, it was clearly their duty to have stated so to the House, and not to have ignored a question of such vital importance. If they proposed using a portion of the surplus revenue which they said they had, it was only proper for them to have intimated as much. Then there was the measure, so long promised, for the establishment of a Supreme Court for the Dominion. During the previous Sessions, it had been deemed worthy of mention in the speech, but now it was consigned to obscurity in company with other questions of public importance. It had been stated that a bill was actually prepared and printed during the recess, but now according to all appearance it had disappeared entirely. He was glad that the difficulty in the North West Territory had been arranged satisfactorily, and that that country now formed a peaceful section of the Dominion. He had always had his doubts respecting the policy of sending the expedition to Red River. If the difficulty were really of a very serious character, then the expedition was too small; if there was little reason to apprehend trouble, then it was altogether unnecessary. Again, reference was made to the Union of British Columbia with the Dominion. It was gratifying certainly to many persons to see the Dominion enlarged in area and increasing in influence, but it must not be forgotten at the same time that Canada was to defray not only the expenses of the local Government of British Columbia, but was to bind herself, according to the contemplated arrangement, to build a railway to the Pacific. It had been often said that the Intercolonial Railway would be a burthen to the people of the Dominion, for a long time to come, but here was a project now mooted, to quadruple the expense of that line—to build a road which would pass through a country mostly barren.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—No, no!

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—He was quite prepared to substantiate his assertion, that the country through which such a railway would have to pass was barren to a great extent, and that such an enterprise could never be made profitable. The people of British Columbia might be a very loyal people—very anxious to unite with Canada; but he could not understand why they should not be willing to join their fortunes with the Dominion except at such an enormous price. In order to settle certain difficulties in the Province of Nova Scotia, it has been found necessary to make very

considerable concessions to her, over and above those in the Act of Union. Now at that moment the Province of Quebec was remonstrating against an unjust arbitrament which had lately taken place, and would be probably placed in the same position as Nova Scotia, and forced to assume an attitude of hostility to the Union, unless her rights were considered in their integrity. That question of the arbitration was certainly one of great importance, and yet the Government were entirely silent on the subject, while it was clearly their duty to enunciate some policy in order to set at rest the fears of the people of the Province of Quebec. He had no intention of going at length into that question, but he could not refrain at that juncture from entering his protest against the action which had been taken in that matter. As respects the Fisheries, there were several points on which he required information. No one could doubt that among the varied resources of the Dominion, none were more valuable or inexhaustible than the Fisheries, and it was therefore very important that our interests respecting them should be carefully protected. In common with others, he was anxious to know how far the Government were cognizant of the movement for the meeting of the Commission. Was the High Commission to mature an arrangement which would be a mere repetition of the Ashburton Treaty, in which the rights of the British Provinces had been notoriously sacrificed? England was very desirous of coming to some amicable adjustment of the difficulties between herself and the United States, and was it not just possible that her interests might not always coincide with those of Canada when the questions in dispute were discussed and arranged. Under these circumstances he did not see how our rights were to be safely confided to a Commission, composed equally of English and American nominees. It was not satisfactory to see that the *Alabama* question, which England was very desirous of arranging equitably, was mixed up with the question of the Fisheries in which she had comparatively little interest. True it had been stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the whole strength of Great Britain would be exerted to sustain our rights to the fishing grounds. At that moment he could not say whether that honourable gentleman was prepared to assert that the British Government was willing to defend the rights of Canada, to the extent which he (Mr. Mitchell) had, to his credit, asserted them (hear). In accordance with his usage, he would not interpose any obstacle to the passage of the address, but would conclude with the expression

Hon. Mr. Le Tellier de St. Just.

of the wish that the united labours of both sides of the House would tend to promote all the great interests of the Dominion. He had been among those who had looked upon Confederation with suspicion, but now that it was *un fait accompli* it was his duty to assist in working it out to the best of his ability.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the hon. member who had just sat down had spoken in his usual temperate strain, and the Government would be certainly hypercritical if they complained of the tenor of his remarks. As respects the complaint that no reference was made in the Speech to several topics, it must be remembered that the Government were obliged to exercise their discretion. The question of Canal extension or enlargement was not one which could be satisfactorily mentioned in the Speech, but he would venture to say that before the House rose the policy of the Government upon that subject would be fully explained, and that then the hon. member would have an opportunity of criticising that policy as fully as he could wish. As respects the withdrawal of the troops, he would say that it had been shown time and again that under all circumstances the British Government would defend the Dominion with the full force of the Empire whenever the occasion arose. Various British Governments had laid down the policy, which was so clearly enunciated that it ought now to be hardly necessary to mention it. He felt he only expressed the sentiment of the country when he said that the people of Canada were always ready to repel with their forces any bands of Fenians that might invade our soil. It was true Canada had nothing to do with the origin of the difficulties which led the Fenians to attempt to strike a blow at England on Canadian soil. On this account, it might be fairly urged that England should contribute a fair share of the expenses which Canada had to pay in repelling the invaders from her border. The hon. member would find, when certain papers were submitted to Parliament, that the Government had not been forgetful of their duty in connection with this question.

He was glad to find that the hon. gentleman rejoiced in the settlement of the troubles that at one time threatened the peace of Manitoba. Last session he had expressed the hope that no blood would be shed, and that the mission of the Expedition would be really one of peace. The results of the policy of the Government had been fully as satisfactory as they had anticipated. Order had been restored,

and the new Governor had shown that the Government had acted most wisely in selecting him for so trying a position. As respects the strength of the force, it was quite sufficient, when we remembered the smallness of the whole adult population (not more than 2,500) a very small portion of whom were supposed to be disaffected. He was surprised to hear his hon. friend deplore the necessity of having a railway between the Atlantic and Pacific. That hon. gentleman must know that no real union could ever take place with British Columbia, unless there was a direct communication established between her and Canada. The country through which the railway would have to pass was as fertile as any portion of the Western States. As far as the base of the Rocky Mountains, there was a country, rich in soil and well watered; whilst beyond those Mountains was British Columbia, abounding in mineral and other resources, and possessing fine harbours on the Pacific shores. So far from looking at the Railway as a very hazardous enterprize, he was among those who believed it most desirable on account of the stimulus it must give to immigration, agriculture, and commerce in a wide and fertile region, now a mere wilderness. The hon. gentleman had also regretted that there was no reference to the Arbitration between Ontario and Quebec; but he should remember that there was no necessity at present for mentioning that topic. It might ultimately come before the Government but at present there was no reason at all why they should refer to it. The hon. member was also hardly fortunate in his remarks respecting the Fishery Commission, but when he came to read the papers on the subject he would see how incorrect he was in his inferences.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST explained that he had said that the House was left in the dark whether the Commission had been appointed at the demand, and with the previous knowledge of the Canadian Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The appointment of the Commission was not made without the knowledge of the Government. It was, it must be admitted on all sides, a great advantage to have Canada represented on the Commission. The fishery question was the most prominent topic ostensibly before the Commission, and why that was so, it might be easily imagined. It would be in the memory of all, that the Johnston-Cleendon treaty respecting the *Alabama* claims was not adopted by the Senate of the United States, and under those circumstances the British Govern-

ment might have some hesitancy in approaching the Americans again directly on that question. Then it was proposed to submit the fishery question to a Commission, and subsequently suggested to refer the *Alabama* and other disputed matters to the same body. It was gratifying to the people of Canada to know that they would be represented on that Commission by one of their ablest statesmen, and the report must be unanimous in order to have any effect in the decision of the vexatious questions submitted to the Commissioners. It was not necessary to say much on the subject of the Supreme Court Bill; it had been mentioned in previous speeches, and probably the Government felt nothing more could be said about it. If the Government decided to present another Bill, the hon. member would have ample opportunity of dealing with it in accordance with its merits. The hon. member had also expressed a desire to know whether the assistance which had been hitherto given us in protecting our fisheries would be continued for the coming season. He (Mr. C.) had no doubt that the same instructions which were given last year to the British cruisers would be given next summer; but the hon. member must remember that the chief protection last season was afforded really by the Canadian vessels, (hear, hear). It was certainly always desirable to have Her Majesty's vessels in the neighbourhood, in order to guard against contingencies, and to show any ill disposed persons the impossibility of successfully resisting lawfully constituted authority.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST explained that the greater portion of the country between Collingwood and the Rocky Mountains was notoriously unfit for cultivation. Even the country between Fort La Corne and Mackenzie River was only useful for settlement to a limited extent. He made these assertions from a knowledge of the country, derived from persons who had travelled over it and studied its capabilities. As respects the question of the Fisheries, he would have preferred an answer from the Minister of Marine who would probably have been more free in his communications than the Postmaster General, whose mode of getting rid of an embarrassing topic was well understood by the House.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—There is ample time before the Session closes.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that it would not be consistent with the interests of the Maritime Provinces were he to allow the debate to close without a reference to a subject of such vital importance to those Provinces as the question of the Fisheries.

That question had now become of national importance—one involving the honour and interests of this section of the Empire. He did not propose to argue the question of right, for the argument was all on one side. It was certainly important on the eve of the assembling of the Commission, to state the grounds on which we stood prepared to defend our position. The people of the Maritime Provinces held with his hon. friend from Quebec that our title to these inestimable treasures of the sea, was as valid as our right to the mines and forests of the land. (Hear, hear.) He did not believe for a moment that the British Government any more than our own was prepared to barter away those rights without any material equivalent. During many years past we had shown that we were willing to share these privileges with others on equitable terms, and now all we asked was that these Fisheries should not be given away without our receiving a *quid pro quo*. (Hear, hear.) It was well known, for many years, seizures were made, and adjudications passed upon those seizures, without remonstrance; our title, apart from the question of headlands, had never been called into doubt. As respects the question of headlands, he was happy to find that it had been left in abeyance by the Minister of Fisheries, and that therefore no difficulty had arisen on that point. Who could doubt, however, that if any of our fishermen were to put into Chesapeake Bay to-morrow, and commence fishing, they would be treated to a very short shrift. As respects the Bay of Chaleurs, it was a question for natural concession and compromise. He was glad to hear from the hon. Postmaster General that the Government had thought it right to ask the British Government to contribute towards the expenses of the recent Fenian invasion, which had been so gallantly repelled by our Volunteers. He would have been better pleased, however, if there had been a demand made upon another Government for allowing their citizens to invade a friendly and unoffending people. It would be remembered how, some years ago, in the case of the St. Alban's Raid—with which Canadians had nothing whatever to do—the government generously reimbursed the losses which the Americans sustained. He would therefore like to know why we were not now entitled to the same amount of consideration from a country, whose citizens—not foreigners and strangers to the soil—had so unwarrantably invaded Canada.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—This will be one of the claims submitted to the Commission.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—It ought certainly
Hon. Mr. Dickey.

to be placed before them. The American Government was clearly responsible to us, inasmuch as it never took proper precautions to prevent those raids. He could not sit down without expressing his gratification at the statement in the Speech respecting the condition of the revenue, and the prospect of a reduced taxation. He hoped, under these circumstances, the Government would see their way clear to abolish the newspaper postage and the stamp duty. As respects the Bay Verte Canal, to which reference had been made, he was quite satisfied to know that a survey was now being made of that contemplated work, and that it was also one of the questions under the consideration of the Commission appointed some months ago.

Hon. Mr. HOLMES could not refrain from saying a few words expressive of his gratification at the satisfactory results of the political and financial management of the affairs of the Dominion by the present Government. He was not among those who believed that the British Government would ever desert these colonies—it was quite sufficient for us to know that England had never yet done so. He was surprised to hear one hon. member (Mr. Letellier) doubt the advisability of constructing a railway to British Columbia, and in this connection he referred to the benefits of railway communications in new countries. When the Province of Nova Scotia had a comparatively small population and revenue she went to large expenditures to construct railways; and was it to be said that the Dominion, with its enormous resources, was not equal to the building of a road which was of itself indispensable to her unity and progress. It would be, indeed, an auspicious day in the history of this country, when we should see the Atlantic bound to the Pacific by iron rails laid through British territory. He rejoiced to find that the revenues of Canada were so prosperous, and hoped that tax on knowledge—newspaper postage—would now be repealed, since there was a promise of reduced taxation.

The resolution embodying the Address was then adopted.

It was resolved that the Address should be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are members of the Privy Council.

ENQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked permission to put an enquiry to the Government respecting the last appointment to the Ministry. It was well understood that Sir Edward Kenny represented a certain portion of the population, namely, the English speaking Catholics. When the late

Mr. McGee was offered a seat in the Cabinet, he waived his claim in favour of the Hon. Mr. Kenny. He must express his opinion that that body to whom he was referring were sufficiently influential to be represented in the Council.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government had to regret that in making the appointment in question—that of the Hon. Dr. Tupper to the Presidency of the Council—they were not able to recognize the claims of the body in question. It was of course a great advantage, and the Government fully appreciated it, to have that class of the population represented in the Administration of the day. Unfortunately they were now deprived of that advantage, but nevertheless the interests and feelings of that body would always receive the fullest and fairest consideration at their hands.

The House then adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 17, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.

After a petition from ex-Postmaster Sewell for an indemnity, had been read

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE.

The Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked if the Grand Trunk Railway had asked permission to erect an additional bridge on or near the Lachine Canal, at the Wellington Bridge, Montreal, and if so, when the permission was applied for and when granted.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Railway Company was allowed to cross the canal with a swing bridge at Wellington street, to be built at the place and in the stead of the existing bridge, and subject to the conditions he would lay before the House, which were as follows:

1st. That the railway track on the south side of the canal shall, as far as practicable follow the line of Wellington street from the limit of government property formed by St. Etienne street to proposed swing bridge.

2nd. That said bridge be built by the Grand Trunk, subject to the approval of the Minister of Public Works, with its railway track in the centre; the said track to be planked to the upper end of the rails, so as to be available for ordinary traffic when trains are crossing the bridge.

3rd. The Grand Trunk shall bind itself to complete the said bridge at such period as

the Minister of Public Works shall determine, and to extend its railway track thence to the harbour of Montreal within twelve months from the 1st May next.

4th. The Grand Trunk also to conform to all other conditions and regulations as the Minister of Public Works from time to time may deem necessary for the safety and convenience of the public, and for the full use of the canal.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—When was the permission applied for, and when granted?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—Applied for on 17th January, 1871, and granted 28th January.

GRAND TRUNK.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for returns of statements, showing the gross earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway during certain years. Carried.

MANITOBA CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved an address for copies of all instructions to Lieutenant-Governor Archibald also copies of all reports and official correspondence between the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Dominion Government from the date of his appointment.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that while no objection would be urged to furnishing the returns asked for, it would be as well to mention exactly the papers which were wanted. There was a very large amount of correspondence continually passing between the Local Government and the Dominion Government, only a portion of which could be of any service to the hon. member.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he only wished to obtain that portion relative to the new system of Government, the division of the Province into electoral districts, and everything, in fact, connected with the new order of things. He did not want the formal correspondence.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER called the attention of the honourable member to the fact that Lieutenant Governor Archibald was the Governor of the North West Territory as well as of Manitoba.

The motion was amended in accordance with the suggestion, and carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS submitted the public accounts for the year (applause).

Mr. MACKENZIE—It will save us a great deal of trouble.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS also laid on the table details of expenditure for the defence of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Perhaps the hon. member will give us details of all the expenditure from the fund for unforeseen expenses.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said they would be submitted in a few days.

MOTIONS.—BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for an address for copies of all correspondence between the Government and British Columbia, its delegates, or the Imperial Government relative to the admission of such colony into the Dominion; also copies of all orders in council or other documents relating to such negotiation.—Carried.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for an order of the House for copies of all Tenders for Works on the Intercolonial Railway since the last return, and in the same form; also copies of advertisements calling for such Tenders, the names of the newspapers in which such advertisements were inserted, and amount paid for same; also copies of Tenders received for locomotives or other rolling stock, and for rails with the same information regarding advertisements; also a statement showing the number of engineers, and engineers' assistants, pay-masters and other employees in each District and Section on the 1st day of July 1870, and also the number of men employed in each Contract Section on that day; also copies of all reports of Engineers, Commissioners or others regarding the change made from the route selected by Major Robinson between Bathurst and the Miramichi River; also copies of all Correspondence between the Railway Commissioners and the Government, relative to contracts and all orders in Council relative to such correspondence or contracts.—Carried.

CORRESPONDENCE ON NORTH WEST.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for an address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government concerning the North West Territories since November 1st, 1869 with Copies of all orders in Council or other documents relative thereto; also copies of all Correspondence with the Commander-in-chief and the Commanding Officer of the Expedition, and copies of all orders in Council or other documents relating to the expedition; also a statement in detail of all expenses incurred in connection with sending the Military expedition giving the names of parties receiving money, and stating the nature of

Mr. Mackenzie.

the service and whether by contract or otherwise,—Carried.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved an address for copies of all correspondence, reports of engineers, or other documents, relating to the leasing by the Government to the Montreal Warehousing Company of a lot of land bordering on the Lachine Canal. He said he feared the Government had committed a serious error in regard to this matter. Five or six years ago a lot of land on the Lachine Canal had been purchased by the Government for the extension of harbor facilities in Montreal. It was allowed to lie fallow, so to speak, a long time, but during last summer or autumn was leased to a private company, the Montreal Warehousing Company for a long term of years, as he was informed, at a rental considerably less than the interest on the cost of the lot. The Government were mistaken in leasing, or lending this lot at all to private parties. But admitting they were right in diverting it from public to private uses, it should have been put up to public competition.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN thought no opinion should have been given in this matter till the papers were laid before the House. A discussion would then be in order. He had no doubt those papers would satisfy the House the Government had acted right in this matter.

The motion was carried.

THE SILVER QUESTION.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON then moved for a statement of the amount of American silver withdrawn from circulation and the details of the expenses, and so forth, thereby incurred; and also a statement showing the total amount of the new issue of silver coin, the cost of coinage and the profit to the Government resulting from the issue.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said there could be no objection to giving this information. But he thought he would only do right in taking the earliest opportunity of stating what the action of the Government had been with respect to the removal of this coin. He would not enlarge at present on the very great loss and inconvenience to the country, resulting from the circulation of this American silver. On his acceptance of office, he found that the subject engaged the very serious consideration of the House during the previous session. He found that during that session a large special committee had been appointed, of which the hon. member for North Oxford was the chairman, for the purpose of investigating.

the matter. They reported a number of resolutions, and recommended that the plan adopted by Government in 1868, by which silver to the amount of one million was purchased and exported, be again tried, or that the Government should in some way withdraw silver to the amount of five millions from the circulation of the country. The last resolution

was not adopted by the House, and it seemed to him that the plan adopted by his predecessor did not meet with their approval. From the best information that he (Sir Francis) could obtain—and he might say that the result had rather confirmed his impression—the estimated amount of silver in the country which had been in circulation for a period of about five years' past, was something about \$10,000,000. Under the operations of Mr. Wier, it cost a good deal to remove the silver from circulation. When the Government took up this matter, they were of opinion that it was exceedingly desirable that the public should be put to as little cost as possible. He believed that a scheme could have been devised for removing the silver, by which the country would incur no expense, but it would have been opposed. It would be remembered that the coin was received in the first place at four per cent, afterwards it was increased to five and then to six per cent, at which it stopped, and, he might say, after all the coin had been received. If it had been put down to six per cent at first, it would have paid all the expenses of removal. He would like, before sitting down, to call the attention of the House to the enormous loss which the public sustained by the circulation of this silver. They knew that nine millions of dollars were exported, and it was estimated that between one and a quarter and one and a half millions of dollars remained in circulation in the country. Therefore, there was upwards of ten millions in circulation. Now, from the best information he could obtain, six millions of this amount changed hands every month, which would give for the twelve months of the year, a circulation of \$72,000,000. He saw his hon. friends (Hon. Mr. Holton and Mr. Mackenzie) smiling, but he would tell them that estimate had been carefully prepared. On this \$72,000,000, at the broker's rate $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. commission, there was an actual loss of \$180,000 per year, which would give for the five years a loss of \$900,000. But that was not the whole loss. There was besides a loss of four per cent which might be fairly calculated, making a total loss during the five years of between fourteen and fifteen millions of dollars. The hon.

gentlemen opposite smiled, and no doubt would argue that if one class of persons lost another gained this money. He would not deny the fact, but there was an actual loss on the six millions of dollars in circulation, nevertheless. It displaced six millions of bank notes, and thereby diminished the actual amount of the capital of the country by six millions. If it was an advantage to the country to employ the paper to take the place of gold, it must be so.

Mr. MILLS—Is not silver capital?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—It was depreciated capital.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—It was clear that six millions in bank notes could not be employed, owing to the circulation in the country of foreign silver.

Mr. MACKENZIE—That is, it reduced the profits of the banks on that amount.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—It was a loss to the country at large, and he therefore entered into communication with Mr. Wier, of Montreal, whose name had been brought into discussion last year, to see whether the silver could be removed without any risk whatever to the public, on the same terms and at the same cost as in his previous operation on one million dollars, the accounts of which had been laid before the House, and had been considered unobjectionable by the Committee. He had the satisfaction of knowing that although the cost of removing \$4,800,000 under this operation was very nearly the same as in the other case, still the difference was slightly in favor of the last. Of course, a great deal of this silver was sold at a loss in New York, upon the price paid for it here, in consequence of the pressure on the New York market having reduced the price. In anticipation of the papers coming down, he would not say anything further on this matter on the present occasion. With reference to the new coinage, he would remark that steps were taken, at the earliest moment, to have it issued to exactly the same value as the previous money issued under an order in Council. He might say with regard to the composition of the coin, that it was standard silver, which was made of something like twelve and a fraction parts of pure silver, with an alloy of one part of copper. It was bought by the mint at the rate of 5s. and 2d. per ounce, which would be 62 shillings per pound standard silver. The mint coined it and issued it at an advance of six per cent. The amount coined for this country was \$750,000. Of course, there were various charges on it, but he was happy to say there was a profit on the operation of something like \$14,000, and

he would remark here, that if any one would carry out the calculation, he would perceive that if Canadian coin to the amount of \$4,800,000 (the amount of foreign silver exported) had been brought into the country, they would have cleared all expenses. But there were reasons why this was not advisable. It would, if carried out, have resulted in depreciating the silver in value. As far as his information went, he heard from time to time that when the banks wanted to pay out silver, people asked them for fractional notes instead. The public seemed not to be so entirely displeased with the notes as the honourable member for Lambton was, still the Government had shown no disposition to force this fractional currency into circulation. On the contrary, he was sure there would be no trouble in largely increasing the circulation; but he quite agreed with the honourable member opposite that nothing could have a worse effect than to have the supply in excess of the demand. They were received at the banks and were not allowed to go out again into circulation when it could possibly be avoided.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had no desire, in asking for those returns, to find fault with the Hon. Finance Minister. It was a desirable object to export the foreign silver from the country, and some of the steps taken by the hon. gentleman, while not being exactly what he would have approved of himself, were good (hear, hear). The question arose, though, if the hon. gentleman had done so well this year, why it was that the other hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches did not do so long ago, and prevent such loss to the country (laughter). The hon. gentlemen could not escape the responsibility of having inflicted on the country all this loss and inconvenience. With reference to that part of his motion relating to the fineness of the new silver, his object was to show the amount of base metal the Government were authorizing into circulation as the legal tender of the country. There could be no difficulty in arriving at this knowledge for he took it for granted that the order in Council authorizing the issue must show the percentage of alloy used in the coin and he thought the House was entitled to know precisely that percentage. By the first part of the motion, he simply wished to ascertain what amount of American silver had been withdrawn and at what cost.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said, with regard to the attack made on the Government for not having taken this measure sooner, he thought if the hon. gentleman would only reflect a little,

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

he would see that it was only last year the Government were in a position to do it. If he (Sir Francis) had to take the same course his predecessor had been compelled to do—to go into the market and sell bonds at a discount of two per cent—he would have shrunk from doing so. The reason why he (Sir Francis) had undertaken it was because the Government had greater means at their command, and were better able to carry out the scheme. Mr. Wier could not carry it on without borrowing money at a large per cent. of interest from the banks, and it was for that reason that he had not succeeded.

Mr. JOSEPH DUFRESNE thought the removal of the American silver had an excellent effect upon the trade of the country. The need of its withdrawal was pressing, and the mode adopted had admirably answered the purpose in view. The country generally was satisfied with the results achieved, whatever the brokers may think.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought the Finance Minister had reason to congratulate himself on the success of his scheme for the removal of the silver. That honourable gentleman had undertaken his (Sir A. T. Galt's) defence. Now he did not think he required any defence of his conduct while Finance Minister. He had only been in office two years from 1862, and should not be charged with the whole blame of the state of the currency up to the removal of the depreciated silver.

The motion was then carried.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT asked for copies of all correspondence between the Governments of the Dominion and England since 12th Feb., 1870, on the subject of the fisheries, and of the proposed Imperial and United States Joint Commission, with the minutes of Council relating to the same. He said there was not as correct an idea prevalent, with regard to the submission of correspondence, as there ought to be. The fault committed here was one of reticence. All correspondence with the English Cabinet not marked by it "private and confidential" should be brought down. In this case there was a great need of as much frankness as possible. There was a feeling of uneasiness abroad in regard to the Fisheries. If the Government had confidence on the subject, it could only spring from the contents of the correspondence that had taken place with the Imperial authorities (hear hear). It was quite as important the country at large should be put in possession of it, so that it should experience

similar confidence (cheers). Indeed it was even more important. The English practice was to bring down correspondence far more fully than we had done usually. As to the most important questions with which the British Government had recently been engaged, it had not waited the assembling of Parliament, but had made public its correspondence through the medium of the press (hear, hear). He need but cite the recent communications with Prince Gortschakoff and the American Secretary of State, the one on the Eastern and the other on the questions between the States and England. He would like, in particular, to see the despatch or order in council of March 23rd 1866.

Hon. Sir J. A. MACDONALD admitted it had been the practice of late, in England, to be very free in the matter of the publication of correspondence. He himself thought the practice proper and beneficial. His own customary phrase on such occasions — "all papers that could be brought down without detriment to the public service," was not prompted by any desire to withhold from Parliament or the country information to which they were entitled, and which could with any prudence be asked. The phrase was more one of form than anything else, and with regard to the present papers, meant nothing unbecoming the importance of this question or the rights of the Legislature. He had no objection to send down all the documents which the public interests warranted. He thought there would be no difficulty about this despatch.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he observed a statement in a recent pamphlet by a gentleman lately a colleague of hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, to the effect that it had been a practice of theirs to keep back or mutilate papers demanded by members. There was no denying the impression prevalent in this House, that papers had been withheld that should not have been. Any one who looked over the Imperial blue-books could see that papers usually refused Canadian members, could be had a month or two afterwards through those compilations. Last year he moved for correspondence concerning the defence of the country, which we were told could not be brought down. Constant reiteration seemed necessary to success. Papers should be available as soon as the circumstances of the country justified their production (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said as to the recent pamphlet by a former colleague, who he could be he had no curiosity to know, but he was satisfied

that no former colleague of his would have possibly submitted to any mutilation of papers while in office, and that if any mutilation had since been effected, he could know nothing about it (laughter and cheers).

Mr. MACKENZIE—As to that he had no knowledge; nor was it any of his business (laughter).

THE DEFENCE QUESTION.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT proposed his last motion for all correspondence, orders in council, and other papers relating to the mission of the Hon. Alex. Campbell to England, and his report thereon. He said he wished for explanations regarding the important subjects covered by the papers asked for here. He was not aware that when the House was prorogued last session the question of defence stood in any different position from that of 1865, the year of the mission to England on this subject. The agreement we then entered into was that Canada should maintain a sufficient militia force, and undertake the erection of fortifications at places west of Quebec and elsewhere. England assumed the fortification of Quebec and the armament of all the defences. There was a general assurance given that on Canada's devoting to the defence of the country all her resources in men and money, England would help her with all the forces at her command. A plan of defence embracing land and naval preparations was also agreed upon. In conformity with that agreement Canada passed an Act providing for fortifications. No action thereon had been taken, nor had the Government declared what it intended. From the omission of the subject from the speech he presumed it was not the intention of Ministers to bring the matter before Parliament. Up to the close of last session no statement was made as to any change in the relations between England and Canada on the subject of her defence. Immediately after the country was startled by the removal of the troops. No one would desire their retention here for the mere purposes of the colonies. If kept, they ought to be strictly kept for Imperial purposes. For local purposes we should supply the whole means of defence. But the circumstances which justified the proposal to remove the greater part of the troops were suddenly altered by the recurrence of the Fenian raid, in the repulsion of which the troops were extremely valuable as coadjutors of our Militia. The order for their withdrawal within a few hours after the repulse of the Fenians, certainly excited a strong feeling of uneasiness

throughout the country. He believed that the Government, perceiving the existence of this uneasiness, desired to have explanations respecting the recall of the troops from the Imperial Government—at least the papers so stated—and hence the mission of Mr. Campbell to England. He (Sir A. T. Galt) desired to know Mr. Campbell's instructions, and the result of his mission. His return was followed by steps in direct contravention of the agreement made in 1865 with the Imperial Government. A transfer of the forts and military material was made to the Colonial Government. Guns and other warlike necessities were shipped to England in violation of the agreement that the armament for our fortifications should be provided at her expense. The defence of the country was, of course, rendered more difficult by the removal of those materials. We have not ourselves large military stores in our possession; nor was it expected we should have. Their removal materially affected the ability of this country to defend itself. He thought there must have been explanations required and given with regard to the causes that led to the adoption of that policy. However, notwithstanding the many reasons for the stationing of a military force for a time at Red River, within a few days after the arrival of the expedition there, it was withdrawn. Was it with the recommendation of the Canadian Government? The article in "Blackwood" on this Expedition had received a good deal of attention from its supposed origin with the distinguished commander of that force. He (Sir A. T. Galt) would not have noticed it but for this circumstance, and the gross injustice therein done the public men and people of Canada. Its language was a malicious slander upon them, as none could fairly say that a colonial politician was a synonym for a corrupt individual, (cheers). He could not believe the commander of the expedition guilty of such an insult and slander unless confronted by the clearest proof. The correspondence he asked for should show why this change of policy had taken place; why the troops had been withdrawn, and were we expected to complete these fortifications, and generally why the engagement of 1865, that all the resources of the Empire would be employed in our defence, should have been modified. If the Government possessed this information they were bound to give it to the public, that every one might know whether, hereafter, as some in high places in England alleged, the defence of this country was to be confined to naval efforts (cheers). This was the statement attributed to the

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt.

Chancellor of the Exchequer. He (Sir A. T. Galt) was sorry to say he thought the course taken towards these Colonies indicated that that was the policy of the Imperial Government, and could not believe our Ministers ignorant of what it intended doing in this respect; and, if so informed, he asked the papers for the purpose of relieving the minds of the people on the subject. If, on the other hand, the Imperial Government, did not entertain such a policy for the defence of Canada, we were entitled to know it at the earliest possible day (cheers).

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said it would have been well to ask for all papers connected with the defence of the country, to which the mission of the Postmaster General was related. He was glad of this motion, which enabled the Government to produce more papers than might otherwise have been procurable. The policy of 1865 between both countries respecting the defence of Canada still existed. The despatch respecting our defence did not certify the amount of the force to be kept in Canada. The Imperial Government reserved to itself the right of deciding where its forces should be stationed, and what disposition should be made of them for the benefit of the Empire. Now the recent policy of England had been one of concentration. The despatches soon to be laid before this Parliament would show that, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the troops, Britain still stood pledged to defend this country (hear, hear).

Mr. F. JONES said that all the recent acts of Great Britain—her whole policy, in fact, showed there was no disposition whatever to abandon her responsibility for the defence of Canada. This discussion was therefore quite irrelevant, it being calculated to throw injurious doubts on Britain's intentions and immemorial policy.

A message from His Excellency was read notifying the House of the appointment of Hon. Joseph HOWE, in the place of Hon. William Macdougall, C. B., to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioner under the Act respecting the internal economy of the House.

The House then adjourned at 5:05 p.m. till Monday next.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, February 20th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS.

A petition was presented from the Dominion Board of Trade, praying for the repeal of certain duties on coal, flour, &c.

Also, a petition from C. W. Taylor, of the city of Ottawa, praying for employment in the Senate.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS laid on the table a return of all bonds and securities registered in the Department of the Secretary of State of the Provinces.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER gave notice of motion for a return of certain papers respecting the arbitration between Ontario and Quebec.

Hon. Mr. RYAN gave notice of motion for return respecting copyrights.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST allowed his motion respecting Fisheries to stand over until to-morrow.

ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I rise for the purpose of moving, in accordance with the notice on the paper, that an address of congratulation be presented to His Excellency the Governor General on his elevation to the Peerage of the United Kingdom. It must be gratifying to His Excellency to have received addresses of a similar character from the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec, and I have no doubt others will be sent him by the other Provinces. I am quite sure every member of the House will cordially unite in the feeling of satisfaction to which this address gives expression. His Excellency's services have extended over various parts of the world, and every one must be aware that they have been of a distinguished nature. The honour now conferred upon him we may safely conclude, has been given him in consequence of his services in this country; and we have, therefore, peculiar reason to be gratified. With these few words I beg leave to move the following address:

"We, Her Majesty's faithful and loyal subjects the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to approach Your Excellency with the expression of our sincere congratulations on Your Excellency's elevation to the Peerage of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. We unfeignedly hope that Your Excellency may long live to enjoy the distinguished honour which our Sovereign has been pleased so graciously and so worthily to bestow."

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—It is gratifying to me to second the motion just moved by the Hon. Postmaster General. The mark of distinction which His Excellency has received is due to his ability in the discharge of his duties in the Government of the Dominion. I find, on referring to the re-

cord of his services, that he was elected very many years ago, as member for the County of Cavan. He was Joint Secretary of the Treasury from 1841 to 1844. Subsequently he became Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1852 to 1855, and High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands from 1855 to 1859. We next find him Governor of New South Wales, where he remained from 1860 to 1867; and then Governor General of Canada since 1868. I may perhaps appropriately add to these remarks that he has been true to the motto on his arms:

"Robori prudentia præstat."

The Address then passed unanimously, and it was ordered that it be presented to His Excellency by such members as are members of the Privy Council.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 20th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3-10 p.m.

After Routines.

Mr. CRAWFORD (N. Leeds), in the absence of Mr. Abbott, introduced a Bill to amend the Acts respecting Banks and Banking.

Mr. DUFRESNE introduced a Bill to facilitate the incorporation of the institution *Credit Foncier*.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS laid on the table the charter of the Royal Canadian Bank.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT introduced a Bill for the better protection of navigable rivers.

Mr. MILLS introduced a Bill to render the members of the Legislative Council and Assembly of the Local Legislatures ineligible to seats in this House.

Also, a Bill to provide for the Extradition of criminals of other countries.

Mr. IRVINE presented the final report of the Hochelaga Election Committee, declaring Hon. Mr. Dorion, the sitting member duly elected, and the petition against his election, "frivolous and vexatious."

In reply to Mr. Blake,

Hon. Sir J. A. MACDONALD said it was not the intention of the Government to introduce this session a measure for the trial by Judges of controverted elections.

THE RED RIVER EXPEDITION.

Mr. STEPHENSON asked whether any portion of the Volunteer force at present stationed in the Province of Manitoba has

been, or is likely soon to be, recalled from there, and if so, what battalion is to be reduced, and to what extent; and if both are to be reduced in what proportion is the reduction to be made; also whether in the announced land policy any portion of the public lands in Manitoba will probably be allotted to the Volunteers now in that Province, and if so, what probable quantity per man, and under what conditions such allotments will be made?

Hon. Sir GEO. CARTIER replied that as early as the beginning of January last the Government considered the expedience of maintaining the two battalions. They decided all but two companies should be disbanded about the first of May. Each company was to have three officers, a captain and two lieutenants.

Some Member—And a Chaplain.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Who said Chaplain? (Laughter.) He supposed it was the member for Gloucester, who, with others had made a great ado about a Chaplain. The House would hear more about it before the Session closed. The companies would be maintained for six months, and six months longer if the Government considered their retention necessary. The volunteers who remained in the new Province would receive free grants; how much land he could not say now. The volunteers who would not remain would be carried free to their homes.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked if the men who obtained their discharge since the 21st of January, would receive free grants like the others.

Hon. Sir G. CARTIER—All will receive it who remain in the country. Any men of the depot companies who might like to go there would receive free grants.

In reply to Mr. MASSON, (Soulanges), Sir George Cartier repeated his remarks in French.

DUTY ON COAL.

Mr. MAGILL asked whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session of Parliament, to make any alteration in the Tariff, by which the consumers of coal imported from the United States, may be relieved from the present burthensome duty, levied upon that article?

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he was quite certain the hon. gentleman was too experienced in parliamentary affairs not to know that that question could not be answered till the Budget was brought down (laughter). He was also certain that the hon. gentleman had by this question gained his end (laughter).

Mr. Stephenson.

CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. MAGILL asked whether, as a Commission had been appointed to report upon the question of enlarging the canals of the Dominion, and generally to inquire into the best means for the improvement of our internal water communication, it is the intention of the Government, at an early date, to place any information before this House respecting the progress made by the said Commission; and if such information is to be furnished, will it be in the shape of a report from that Commission, or an announcement of the policy of the Government on the subject of canals.

Hon Mr. LANGEVIN said the Commission had made considerable progress, and would probably report at an early day.

FISHERY CORRESPONDENCE SUBMITTED.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD laid on the table the correspondence respecting the Fisheries, asked for a few days ago by the motion of Sir A. T. Galt. In answer to him the Hon. Premier made the following explanations. He said it was the intention of the Government to take the same steps for the protection of our Fisheries during 1871 as had been lately adopted and now existed. After the cancelling of the Reciprocity Treaty, it would be remembered, the Canadian Government thought fit to assert its Fishery rights. While preparing to do so, communications were received from the Imperial Government that would appear in the papers now before the House, to the effect that there was a probability of fresh proceedings for the renewal of the treaty; and it was suggested, in view of this fact, that the American fishermen should be allowed to fish in the same unrestrained way as before. The Canadian Government represented that they thought such a course would be unwise; that it was better to proceed at once to the assertion of our rights; that to allow our rights to remain in abeyance would be an apparent surrender of them, which would increase the difficulty of their subsequent assertion. Her Majesty's Government having strong opinions on the subject, and the Canadian Government desiring to act in accord with them, a regulation was made at once asserting the rights, and exempting American fishermen from inconvenience during that season. That was accomplished by requiring them to take out license on payment of a nominal fee. The Nova Scotia Government made a strong protest against our going so far; but also preferring to stand in accord with the Imperial Government, they acquiesced in the concession and arrangement made. Subsequent-

ly, as was known, the fee was increased, but still, to a very moderate extent, only to \$1.00, and that was merely for the purpose of again asserting our claims and again showing that we really did intend to protect our fisheries and that it was not to be considered that the establishment of a nominal fee was at all what Canada considered to be the value of her fisheries. In the following season, the license was again increased, but the Government found that the American fishermen were altogether disregarding the regulations, and were continually trespassing in our waters. The number of licenses issued, steadily decreased every year, until at last, he might say, they ceased altogether and American fishermen fished in our waters without obtaining any permission whatever. In 1866, there were 354 licenses issued; in 1867 there were 281; in 1868 they had decreased to 56, and in 1869 to only 25. In other words, the American fishermen insisted on fishing in our waters without giving compensation. The license system was found to be a failure. In consequence of this state of things, the Canadian Government resolved to do away with the licensing system and to exclude foreign fishermen from our waters, preserving our rights for our own people. This was indicated to Her Majesty's Government and they agreed with the Canadian Government to maintain, as before, a naval squadron in our water to aid in the protection of our fisheries. It was thought by the Imperial Government that in addition to the material and moral support we received in the protection of our rights, that we ought to aid that squadron ourselves. We therefore placed a marine police of eight vessels in our waters, to act in accord with Her Majesty's Squadron, Her Majesty's naval officers commanding the united squadron. Under this new arrangement, our fisheries had been on the whole exceedingly well protected, and it was admitted by those who understood the subject, and were specially interested in the reservation of our own fisheries for our own fishermen, that they had been protected in the most efficient manner during the past season, and the papers, when brought down, would show how much we owed to the zealous, prudent and discreet course of Her Majesty's naval officers. It was known to the House that since the treaty of 1818, with respect to our fisheries, that other questions had arisen as to the geographical extent of our fisheries and the construction of the treaty itself. Now, with regard to the question of the renunciation by the United States forever of the right to fish within three miles from our shores, there could be no dispute. ere

was no question raised by the American Government. There was, however, the question commonly called the headland question, which was an important one. By concert with Her Majesty's Government, and in order to secure the material aid and support of that Government, it was arranged that, for the present, the question of headlands should be placed in abeyance; that was not actually enforced. At the same time, it was arranged between the Canadian and Imperial Governments, and the Imperial Government and the Government of the United States, that this right was not to be abandoned in any way, notwithstanding that it was at the time not actually pressed. But, he might say with regard to all questions relating to the Fisheries. Her Majesty's Government and the Canadian Government had been quite in accord, and the Imperial Government had given positive and repeated assurances that not one of our rights should be abandoned or surrendered (hear, hear). It was, however, obvious to the Canadian Government that it was exceedingly inconvenient that we should have rights, or supposed rights, that remained a dead letter—that these rights, especially as regarded the geographical question as to what portions of our waters were included within the terms of the treaty should be defined, and it was exceedingly important that any remaining questions or doubts as to the actual and true meaning of the headland question should be brought to an end. It was, of course, exceedingly inexpedient that we should be continually asserting our rights and at the same time be unable to enforce them. If we had a right we should know it and enforce it, or receive compensation for its abandonment. The Imperial and Canadian Governments therefore had a good deal of correspondence on this point, and it resulted in his colleague—Hon. Mr. Campbell—going to England on that and other matters, and the papers would show that the Canadian Government requested Her Majesty's Government to open communication with the Government of the United States on the headland question for the purpose of establishing the limits of exclusion from our shores, &c. It was decided that it was to be done by a Mixed Commission, on which Canada was to be represented. Canada also requested that the Commission should sit on this side of the water. In due time, Hon. Mr. Campbell got a favourable communication stating that in consequence of the request of Canada, that application would be made to the United States Government. In proper time, when Her Majesty's Govern

ment thought it was advisable to take the necessary steps, they communicated with the United States Government, and it was arranged that there should be a Commission, to be composed in the first place of three representatives on each side. The three named by Great Britain were the British Ambassador, Earl de Grey and himself (Sir John A. Macdonald). The American Government cheerfully assented to the proposition, and expressed a desire to widen the questions to be decided between the two Governments. England assented at once, and at the suggestion of the United States, the Commission was increased to five on each side. The five were Earl de Grey, Lord Tenterden, Sir Stafford Northcote, Prof. Bernard and himself (Sir John A. Macdonald). Thus the case stood, and, as he said before, in the communications which had passed between the two Governments, no rights of Canada would be surrendered in any way, without our consent, and without that the present action of the proposed Commission would not be conclusive (applause)

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said he would like to have the correspondence brought down before the departure of the Premier.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would endeavour to have it submitted to the House without delay.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT having moved for the correspondence between the Dominion and Imperial Governments since February, 1870, on the subject of the Fisheries and of the proposed Imperial and United States' Joint Commission. He questioned the Premier in regard to the character of the papers.

Hon. Sir J. A. MACDONALD said a good many papers were omitted because marked by the Imperial authorities "confidential." The Government had applied for permission, by cable, to submit all the papers.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—Is the Order in Council of 1866, brought down?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—Yes.

Mr. JOSEPH DUFRESNE asked if the action of the International Commission would be confined to the Fisheries, or would it embrace other questions, such as the indemnity for the Fenian raid.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD gave an account of the organization of the Commission. The original idea was the settlement of the Fishery question. Afterwards in acquiescence with the proposal of the United States the "Alabama" matter was included. Then the Canadian Government urged the inclusion of the claims arising out of the Fenian raid. The correspondence on this subject was still proceeding. He had not

seen the *ipsissima verba* of the Commission, and could not tell how much it would undertake. All he knew was that a despatch had been received from England conceding the Canadian demands, and giving Canada representation on the Commission.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Was the Canadian Government consulted as to the enlargement of the Commission's functions?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—No.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked if the Canadian claims arising out of the Fenian raid were to be submitted.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD could not answer that positively. They said they had a claim and asked the Imperial Government to make it on their behalf. The first proposal for the widening of the sphere of the Commission came from the United States, as it could not well have come from the Imperial Government. They wisely consented, however, and so with mutual agreement all questions between the Governments were to be considered.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the letter of Secretary Fish, proposing the enlargement, was limited almost entirely to questions arising from the war. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not see there was any room for the Honourable Premier's expectation, that the United States Government would listen to the Canadian claims as to the raid.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said surely it must be seen it was not probable Mr. Fish would propose the entertainment of those demands.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Of course not.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Therefore he simply proposed what he wanted. But Sir E. Thornton's letter covered not only the Fishery question, but all questions in dispute between the United States and the British Empire. Its words were quite wide enough for that inference.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said they had no evidence the claims had ever been urged on the United States Government.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—The question was first as to the Fisheries.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT confessed that, in his opinion, the correspondence between Mr. Fish and the Imperial Government did not cover the Canadian claim (hear, hear). The first letter of the British Minister at Washington, however, contained general terms which led to the conclusion the Commission might cover everything. But a correspondence must be taken as of the two parties, and the most important letter that passed between the two parties was that of Mr. Fish, which, as he read it,

Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald.

related solely to the claims arising out of the late war. However, he quite understood the Premier's inability to state positively whether the Canadian claims would or would not be considered by the Commission. But he hoped the leader of the Government would take such steps as were necessary to ascertain whether they would or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that if it had been the intention of the Dominion Government to have them so considered, they could tell us whether Mr. Campbell was instructed to make representations on the Fenian Raid to the Imperial Government.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said they had urged on the British Government not only the claims of Canada, but those of private individuals, in connection with the consideration of the *Alabama* claims. They received an official answer that their wishes would receive attention. A large expenditure was incurred by the threats of the raid and the raid itself. The Canadian Government urged its title to an indemnity for that raid. Mr. Campbell had pressed that claim.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the question now arose, whether the statement of our losses, required by Earl Kimberley, was furnished by our Government. If that statement had been sent—

Several Ministers—It has gone.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said they should say when it was sent, and the matter should be included among the papers now brought down.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the main object of the papers related to the Fisheries. The Canadian Government did urge the Fenian claims, but they could not be expected to produce the papers on this subject at present, because he did not know whether this subject would be included with those to receive the attention of the Commission.

Mr. BLAKE said the Premier ought to know what the subjects of the Commission would be, at least in so far as Canada was concerned. The facts were probably known to the United States, and our ignorance of the matter was unsatisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE gave notice that he would move on Wednesday for all the correspondence with the Imperial Government on the subject of the Canadian claims for compensation for the Fenian raid.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MILLS then moved for a statement of the number of days each of the Intercolonial Railway Commissioners was engaged in the performance of the duties of his

office at the seat of Government and on the line of Railway in 1870—Carried.

DEFENCE.

Mr. MASSON said he would not move for the correspondence respecting the military expenditure and defences of the Dominion, since the information was or would be included in papers promised in accordance with other motions.—Dropped.

THE ST. CLAIR FLATS CANAL.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for correspondence and papers relative to the canal built by the United States Government on Canadian territory at the St. Clair Flats or Walpole Island. After referring to the position of the matter in 1866, he said he had no doubt the canal was wholly within our territory. That was the opinion of all the navigators and engineers who had surveyed the route, among the latter Gen. Meade. He trusted that in this, as in every other matter in dispute between the States and Canada, our Government would not yield up anything except upon the best grounds (hear, hear). If this canal be conceded they would be absolutely without a channel on this side of Walpole Island, the land boundary; and it would be impossible for Canada to send a vessel from lake to lake through our territory, as there was no other channel with six feet of water we could call our own.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Government had not lost sight of the matter, being quite aware of its very great importance. They were now in correspondence with Her Majesty's Government on this subject. The correspondence not being completed could not be brought down, and that portion producible might frustrate their object.

Mr. MACKENZIE said perhaps, then, he should let the matter stand. He thought the Minister of Public Works could have answered the question, as he had gone with a war vessel through the canal and taken possession of it (laughter).

The motion was allowed to stand.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE ON WESTERN LAKES.

Mr. OLIVER moved for the correspondence relating to the harbours of refuge on Lakes Huron and Erie, since the last returns were brought down.—Carried.

NORTH WEST INDEMNITY CLAIMS.

Mr. BODWELL moved for a return of the claims made upon the Dominion

Government consequent upon the insurrection in the North West Territories.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said there could be no objection to the fullest information on the subject. The claims embraced in the motion were of different kinds. A considerable number had been filed, a portion of which would be found in the public accounts, others had come in since the close of the fiscal year and been paid, while some were yet before the Board of Audit. There was another class which it had not been in the power of the Government to deal with—those of the refugees who had suffered very considerable loss and inconvenience of different kinds. The most formidable was in behalf of the Hudson's Bay Company (ironical cheers). The Premier stated last session that the claims of the refugees were not considered, because the manner of compensation had not been decided on. It had always been the endeavour of the Government to secure compensation. The claims would be submitted to them, and it was the intention of the Government to prepare a measure of compensation during the present Session. When the Manitoba Bill was passing through the House, the claims of Dr. Schultz, who had been ruined by the troubles, and those of others of similar experience, had been brought before them. (Sir Francis here read a paper signed by Dr. Schultz' creditors, stating that should he be enabled to pay to the amount owed them, they were prepared to furnish him goods to the extent of his ordinary purchases in the same form as before, and thus enable him to resume his business). The debtor's account, or amount claimed was within a mere trifle of \$70,000, which he (Sir Francis) did not think a very reasonable one. There were thirty claims in blank for want of data, being those of individuals rendered destitute. Dr. Schultz stated that with \$500 he would undertake to pay their expenses and send them back to the country. The claims of Dr. Lynch amounting to \$300 was also preferred. Having ascertained Dr. Schultz had been a considerable loser, and that the Government was prepared to assent to the principle of compensation, he advanced a sum of money to that gentleman's creditors for the purchase of some stock. He received \$500 for other refugees and \$300 for Dr. Lynch. He (Sir Francis) was personally responsible for these sums. Believing the sentiment of the House was in favour of these claims (hear, hear), and knowing the Government assented to the principle he had acted as he described. He had under the circumstances, to take a considerable amount of responsibility. Eleven thousand dollars was the sum paid to the

Mr. Bodwell.

creditors of Dr. Schultz. This was a payment made, for which he was personally responsible to the Bank of Montreal. The sum, of course, was not in the public accounts (hear hear).

In answer to Mr. MACKENZIE, Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said there was no doubt compensation would be given, but the manner of giving it was not decided upon.

Mr. MACKENZIE read from an Imperial Blue-Book a report, of a question on the subject of compensation, and the answer of the Premier thereto, to show that the Government, last session took a different view of the matter from the present or used language to justify that impression. This fact could be gleaned from the report in the Blue Book, garbled and imperfect as it was, which had been taken from a pretended official report published by a well-known Ottawa journal, which was not last year at all reliable in matters of this kind. For all that, however, he thought that the version of the Premier's remarks given was in this case to a certain extent reliable, and it showed a difference of the kind he had mentioned.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD thought the hon. gentleman was not quite correct, as he had stated these claims must be paid by somebody; but he was not prepared to say from what sources. That they were due he had no doubt.

The motion was carried.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. STIRTON moved for a statement of the salaries and wages of engineers and staff of the Intercolonial Railway, up to January 1st, 1871.—Carried.

IMPERIAL LEGISLATION FOR MANITOBA.

Mr. BLAKE said he observed from the reports in both the local and Toronto papers that the Hon. Premier had informed the House the other day that he had taken into consideration the constitutionality or legality of the proceedings that had passed in reference to Manitoba in this House, and that he had communicated with the Imperial Government upon the subject. That in accordance with that communication a draft of a Bill to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament had been prepared and was to be sent to England by the next English mail. That Bill was to affect the Manitoba Act, and also to make provision for the government of that country in the future. He could not believe it was possible that the hon. gen-

man could have fully considered the matter when he intimated to this House that it was his attention to send for the action of the Imperial Parliament a proposed measure affecting the rights and interests of this country in the North West, without first submitting it to this House and obtaining its assent. (Here the hon. member sketched the events preceding and connected with the passage of the Manitoba Act in order to show the right of the Canadian Parliament to be consulted previous to the action of the Imperial authorities). He maintained that the leader of the Government had no right to say that he would send home by the next mail a measure which might not be approved by this House, to be converted into an Act of Parliament which would be irrevocable. The House had a right to know, and he insisted that they should know, and have an opportunity of formally deciding upon the prudence or imprudence of the action of the Government. They had suffered enough from past blunders and mistakes with reference to this North West Territory, and Parliament must take to itself the responsibility devolving on it. What they had done in the past they might to a certain extent revoke, but what might be done by the Imperial Parliament was irrevocable. If the hon. Premier did not submit the measure to this Parliament he (Mr. Blake) would follow up this motion by another one by which he would test the sense of the House on the question.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD believed the despatch to be transmitted to England would meet with the approbation of the House and of the country. The one doubt he had was a technical one—whether Government could properly place on the table here a Bill which was to be laid before the Parliament of England. If he found that it was one of that nature, the communication itself and the answer would show in every respect what the measure was designed to be, and the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity of bringing up the question if the scope of the correspondence did not meet his views or the views of this House. At any rate the whole substance of the Bill, excepting the mere wording of it, would be laid before the House.

The motion was carried.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. MACKENZIE wished to know in what state the Reports of the Departments were at present. If they were brought down at an early day it might save hon. members the necessity of moving for so

many returns. Last year and the year before there was much annoyance and hindrance to the public business caused by the delays in bringing down departmental reports, especially the report of the Post Office Departments.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—The Report of the Militia Department will be ready within ten days from this time.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—The Report of the Public Works Department will be submitted in a few days.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS and Hon. Mr. TILLEY replied to the same effect for their Departments.

The House adjourned at 5.25 p. m.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

THE FISHERIES.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that it was his intention to have brought forward the motion of which he had given notice on a previous day, in reference to the correspondence between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on the subject to the Fisheries. Since he had given notice he found that the Government had elsewhere laid on the table a very voluminous report on the subject. Under these circumstances he wished to know whether the Senate would not take advantage of those communications without having a special motion made for the printing of the documents. When the papers were printed they could be submitted to the House,

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said that it would certainly not facilitate matters were the honourable gentleman to make his motion at that time. The Government would submit all the papers in their power to bring before the House. Those papers were now in the hands of the printer, and would be ready as soon as practicable. When they were examined honourable gentlemen could ask for any other information that they might desire.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that it was his intention to have made a motion in respect to the mission of the Honourable Postmaster General, but he understood the documents would be found in the returns to be submitted. When the papers were printed, it would be seen whether any other information was required. He did hope that his honourable friend would

be able to give a personal explanation, sooner or later, of his important mission.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that he had no doubt the Hon. Postmaster General would willingly give any information asked by a member of the House.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Report which he had the honour of submitting to His Excellency was among the papers now in the hands of the printer. When those papers were in the possession of the House he would cheerfully give any further information that it would be in his power to afford.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said that if the Government did not bring these papers formally before the Senate, they would not appear in the journals.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that he was not willing to adopt the plan proposed as a precedent hereafter. It would be a *quasi* waiving of the constitutional right of the Senate. He would be quite satisfied, however, with the assurance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that these papers would be laid on the table.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL had no hesitation in giving the assurance. The motion of the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Letellier,) could stand over for the present.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the papers would appear in the Sessional papers, after the reference to the Joint Committee on Printing.

The notice of motion was allowed to stand.

COMMITTEES.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved, and Hon. Mr. MITCHELL seconded, that the following be the Standing Committees of the Senate for the present session :

That the Hon. Messrs. Aikins, Allan, Archibald, Botsford, Bourinot, Dever, Dickson, Duchesnay, Ferrier, Flint, Guevremont, Hazen, Letellier de St. Just, Macdonald, Northup, Olivier, Perry, Sanborn, Steeves and the mover be appointed a Committee on *Standing Orders and Private Bills*, with power to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to the said Committee, to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records.

That the Hon. Messieurs. Archibald, Benson, Bill, Bureau, Chapais, Churchill, Ferrier, Foster, Hamilton (Kingston), Kenny, McDonald, McMaster, Macpherson, Malhiot, Mitchell, Robertson, Ryan, Simpson, Skead, Smith, Tessier, Wark, Wilnot, and Wilson, be appointed a Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, for the present session, to whom

Hon. Mr. Botsford.

shall be referred all Bills on these subjects.

That the Hon. Messieurs. Armand, Benson, Botsford, Burnham, Christie, Dickey, Dickson, Duchesnay, Dumouchel, Hamilton (Inkerman), Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McDonald, Macpherson, Macfarlane, Miller, Mills, Mitchell, Ryan, Seymour, Shaw, and Tessier, be appointed a Committee to examine and report upon the Contingent Accounts of the Senate for the present session.

That the Honourable Messieurs Aikins, Bureau, Burnham, Dumouchel, Ferguson, Holmes, Locke, Olivier, Reesor, Sanborn, Simpson and Skead, be appointed a Committee to superintend the Printing of this House during the present Session, and to act with the Committee of the House of Commons as a Joint Committee, on the subject of Printing.

That the Hon. Messieurs Allan, Blake, Bourinot, Chaffers, Chapais, Cormier, Ferguson, Hazen, Lacoste, Leonard, Locke, MacFarlane, Malhiot, Miller, Mills, Odell, Panet, Reesor, Steeves and the mover, be appointed a Committee to assist his Honour, the Speaker, in the direction of the *Library of Parliament*, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act on behalf of this House as members of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

The motion was carried.

It was ordered that a message be taken by a Master in Chancery to the House of Commons informing them of the appointment of the two last mentioned Committees.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.

THE CENSUS ACT.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved for leave to introduce a Bill, intituled "An Act to amend the Census Act."

In reply to Mr. Mackenzie, Hon. Mr. DUNKIN explained the nature of the Bill. It was therein proposed to bring in all the territory for census purposes, not now included in the Dominion. The census of British Columbia would thereunder be taken. That was to say, the Act should be extended to Manitoba and British Columbia. The same principle as to mode of procedure and details, now in operation as to the Dominion, would apply

to those distant Colonies. With respect to the time of the census-taking, it was provided in the Bill, that the census might be taken any time between the 1st of May and 30th of September next. It was physically impossible the census should be taken in certain remote regions, early in April next. Machinery was also provided for the collection of information at times apart from those occupied by the enumeration. Other changes of more or less importance—of detail—were provided for.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the provisions of the Bill were excellent. One matter was omitted. Was it intended to take the census of the North West Indians?

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN.—Certainly. It was intended to obtain all the information possible respecting the Indians in our territory.

Motion carried.

RETURNS.

Hon Sir F. HINCKS brought down returns of all expenditure under the head of unforeseen expenses; of the expenses of Hon. Mr. Campbell's mission to England, and of all expenses, etc., connected with the exportation of the depreciated silver.

THE SILVER QUESTION.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON remarked upon the absence of details in the statement respecting the coin; there was nothing to show the manner in which the expenses arose, or the parties therein concerned. Information as to the quality or purity of the coin was also desirable. The mere gross or summary statement was not sufficient.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said with regard to the fineness of the silver in the new coinage, the order in Council of 1867 had been quoted because it described exactly the fineness and value of the silver coinage, which was to be of exactly the same fineness as the British silver. The reference to that order in Council was made merely to establish the fineness. The actual order in Council was to the same effect and could be furnished if required. With regard to the details an agreement to pay at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for all silver exported, was made in order to cover charges. It was calculated that at this rate, Mr. Weir would make a Commission of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent out of the operation. It was thought to be safer to do this than to incur any risks. In point of fact, with regard to that portion of the silver exported, he (Hon. Sir Francis Hincks) happened

to know that the principal bank engaged in carrying on the operation,—he referred to the Bank of Montreal—had increased their rate of commission. They would not go on at the rate they first agreed on with Mr. Weir. There were a great variety of liabilities and responsibilities to be incurred. For instance, sometimes, a package turned out to be short or spurious coins were found in it. Mr Weir's profit after paying all charges, amounted to five-eighths of one per cent. The express charges, the bank commission, the brokerage in New York and charges of that description were paid by the Government and charged to Mr. Weir in the account, making up this $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent he was to get. The only other charges were the charges in England which were chiefly freight, and the Bank of Montreal Commission and the expenses on the silver it was found necessary to send to England, owing to the impossibility of selling more in New York after the market there was glutted. He had not the slightest objection to bring down these returns, but he did not think it was necessary.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he supposed the matter would be referred to the Committee on public accounts and the details could be submitted there. The amount seemed to be very large to him—\$118,000, and it did seem to him that they should have the details of so large an expenditure furnished to the House. Part of that expenditure seemed to have been incurred in New York, part in England, and part in this country, but there was an entire absence of details as to names of persons to whom the money had been paid, and of details generally. The hon. gentleman would see that this \$118,000 constituted more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the gross amount; therefore, there must be some further statement to be made to the House before they could come to a thorough understanding of the matter.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the difference between the total amount of the cost of the exportation and the total amount of the issue arose from the loss in the sale of the silver in New York. There would be no objection to giving further information if necessary.

THE DEFENCE QUESTION.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT called attention to the absence of papers connected with the mission of Hon. Mr. Campbell to England, which he expected would have been brought down. The present papers contained the gist of all produced yesterday.

and, however interesting, were not all that were required.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, after an examination of the papers, admitted they were deficient, stated they were made up without his knowledge, and promised the remainder would be produced within ten days, as soon as they could be copied.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT hoped the Government would look at the returns before transmitting them to the House, so as to avoid similar mistakes.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER promised his attention to the matter.

ELECTION BILL.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD gave notice that he would introduce an Election Bill.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved concurrence in the report of the Special Committee appointed to select the Standing Committees.—Carried.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD also moved the re-appointment of the Library Committee which, in the main, was the same as last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE called attention to the anomalous position of the Library officers, some of whom were under the Senate and some under the House. Some received remuneration from the Upper House in consideration of services rendered. The Library should be placed under the control of a General Committee, the same as the printing. Let there be no duplicating of salaries, which gave rise to confusion. The Government last year promised to consider the matter.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD acknowledged his responsibility for the delay, excusing himself, however, on the ground of severe illness towards the end of last session. The required amendment could only be secured by the adoption of the hon. gentleman's suggestion. It would be well to move an instruction to the present Committee to report on the management of the Library, the salaries of the officers and so forth (hear, hear).

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER was then granted permission to withdraw his imperfect return respecting Hon. Mr. Campbell's mission to England.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the public accounts, the return of the exportation of the depreciated silver, and that relating to the unforeseen expenditure

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt.

be referred to the Committee of Public Accounts.—Carried.

HONOUR TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, congratulating him on his elevation to the peerage of Great Britain. He said he had no doubt the House would cordially adopt this address, and convey to His Excellency, in fitting terms, its congratulatory compliments on the high honour conferred upon him. He had not been long here; but he (Sir John) believed he had won golden opinions from every one, at all events, from all who had been able to follow clearly his course. All agreed he had been a constitutional Governor in the best sense of the term. His services to Her Majesty did not commence in this country. He had had a long life of parliamentary and official experience. His Excellency had had the great advantage of a varied experience both as a representative of the people and an Executive Officer of the Crown. In all those positions he had won cordial and continuous approval from his first entrance upon public life. He went into Parliament for the county in which he resided, and represented it 20 years. Thus he had a thorough training as a representative of the people. As a reward for his services he received practical proof of the confidence of the Government by an important office in the Government of his country. Thus he received the advantage of training in the administration of a government founded upon free constitutional principles. He also held, later, a high and important position in the colonial service as Lord High Commissioner in the Government of the Ionian Islands, and as Governor in Australia. He thus learned how to deal with great Colonial questions, as his previous experience had taught him how to discharge the duties of British Parliamentary life. We were therefore of one accord as to his just claims to the high and distinguished honour Her Majesty had conferred upon him. He would, there was no doubt, be delighted at this mark of our gratification at his good fortune. Since this honour was conferred, Her Majesty had bestowed another which, all things considered, must be more gratifying, proud as was the position of a Peer of the realm—namely, the honour of the appointment of Lord Lieutenant of the country, which he represented twenty years. (Cheers.)

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had much pleasure in seconding the motion. He quite concurred in all that had been said respecting His Lordship the Governor

General. It was one of the great privileges we had enjoyed of late years to live under the administration of a constitutional Governor. The benefits of such a system we were able to appreciate from the inconveniences previously experienced from one of an opposite character. We had not been troubled with any of the evils of arbitrary authority or unconstitutional administration during the term of His Excellency Lord Lisgar. He (Mr. Mackenzie) need not say anything further in praise of that nobleman, as we all acknowledged the facts just mentioned by the hon. gentleman opposite. We all agreed in the eulogies passed by the hon. Premier, and he cordially seconded the motion just submitted (cheers).

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, in a few appropriate remarks, supported the motion, complimenting His Excellency on his faithful, conscientious, and highly satisfactory discharge of the important duties confided to him by Her Majesty. It was our pride, our pleasure, and our great interest to live under his administration. The manner in which he performed his functions left nothing to be desired (cheers). The hon. and gallant baronet proceeded in still happier phraseology to express the above sentiments in the French language and was cordially cheered on resuming his seat.

A committee was then appointed to draw up the address which was immediately presented in the following form.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
GENERAL.

May it please Your Excellency:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the Dominion of Canada in Parliament assembled, beg leave to express to your Excellency, the deep satisfaction with which we have observed your elevation to the Peerage of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

We recognize, in this gracious act of our beloved Sovereign, the appreciation of your eminent services in the numerous responsible positions to which you have had the honour to be called by the Crown, as also the recognition of the wise and eminently judicious manner in which you have represented Her Majesty in this Dominion; and we trust that you may be spared to give, during yet many years, to the Empire, the benefit of your mature judgment and long experience of public affairs.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

THE SUPPLIES.

On motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS

HINCKS, the House took into consideration the address of His Excellency.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS introduced the Supply Bill, and gave notice that he would move the House in Committee on Friday next, for the purpose of considering the measure.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. STEPHENSON asked whether any recent changes have been made in the mode of receiving payments by the Inland Revenue Department, and what the nature and object of such changes have been and whether these have resulted satisfactory?

Hon. Mr. MORRIS replied that certain changes had been made that had worked well and satisfactorily. It had heretofore been found impossible to guard against loss by collectors by the system of receiving security from them. For instance, at Montreal the collector receiving a salary of \$1,600, collected \$919,000 for the year ending 30th June last; the collector at Toronto, \$410,000; and the collector at Windsor, \$524,000. Heretofore all these sums passed into the hands of the collector. The change had been a simple one, and yet it was one that he believed would prove completely effective. It was the substitution of accepted checks or drafts on the banks in favor of the Receiver General, so that all sums exceeding \$500—that being the maximum rate fixed on—would pass directly from the hands of the collector to the Receiver General, thus diminishing the chances of risk to the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE—In other words, copying the plan adopted by the Crown Lands Department in the old Province of Canada.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he adopted the system in use with reference to slide dues and other Departments of the Government, and he was happy to say it worked well.

The House adjourned at 4:20 until tomorrow—to-day being a public holiday.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, Feb. 23, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Hon. Mr. PANET was sworn in as one of the Senators of the Dominion.

INSPECTION LAWS.

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented a petition

from the Dominion Board of Trade, praying for the passage of an Act to consolidate and amend the existing Inspection Laws.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. WARK gave notice that he would move for the appointment of a Special Committee for an enquiry into all matters connected with the survey and location of the Intercolonial Railway since the appointment of the Commissioners, with power to send for persons and papers.

ARBITRATION.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER allowed his motion for papers connected with the arbitration between Ontario and Quebec to stand until the following day.

THE FISHERIES.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, in again allowing his motion to stand over, hoped that all the papers referring to the question would be among the returns to be submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government would bring down all that they were at liberty to submit.

COMMITTEES.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of Hon. Mr. Miller was added to the Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders; and that of Hon. Mr. Renaud to the Committee on the Library of Parliament.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, Feb. 23, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Several petitions were received.

Mr. WORKMAN, presented a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade, for a general inspection law; and one from the Montreal Corn Exchange, against the grain and flour duties, and setting forth the propriety of throwing off duties on the necessaries of life, in order to render this country a cheap one to live in.

REPORTS.

Mr. HARRISON presented the first Report of the Committee on Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. Ryan.

Mr. MACFARLANE presented the first Report of the Committee on Standing Orders.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS presented the first report of the Committee on Public Accounts, recommending the reduction of the quorum to seven members. The motion for its adoption was carried.

A similar proceeding took place in respect of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and of the Committee on Private Bills.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MACFARLANE moved for the introduction of an Act to amend the Railway Act of 1868.

Mr. YOUNG moved that a notice be sent to the Senate informing them that this House had consented to the joint action proposed with a view to the appointment of a Joint Committee on Printing.—Carried.

Mr. HARRISON moved for leave to introduce a Bill to extend the right of appeal in criminal cases.

Mr. BLAKE moved for leave to introduce a Bill to secure the independence of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

A message was received from His Excellency, thanking the House for their loyal address, and their promise to devote their earnest attention to the subjects submitted in the address for their consideration.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

On the submission of supplementary papers to those recently brought down on the subject of the fisheries, and Mr. Campbell's mission to England.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT intimated his desire to proceed with his motion to-morrow.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had no objection to fixing that day. As would be seen by the cable despatches and other advices, it was necessary he should leave for Washington immediately.

Mr. BLAKE asked if the papers would be ready in print to-morrow, and if the Premier could give any further information respecting the scope of the Commission.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD replied that the papers would be printed in English by to-morrow, and that he was in no position to give the information inquired for. The cable despatches showed that the English Ministers were maintaining a reticence on this subject.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES (North Leeds and Grenville) asked whether the Government has instituted any inquiry or investigation in relation to the numerous accidents which have lately occurred on the Grand Trunk Railway, and the great irregularity connected with the delivery of the mails by that road; also whether Mr. Brydges, President of the Grand Trunk Railway is still employed by the Government as one of the Commissioners for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—The returns required by law and the regulations of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, have been made regularly, and no complaint having been made to the Government, and nothing unusual, under the law, appearing to the Government, no investigation has taken place. As for the irregularities in the delivery of the mails I may say that up to the very severe weather we have had, the Grand Trunk Railway carried the mails with greater regularity than they did last year. Of course during the severe weather we have had, the Grand Trunk Railway was subject to the same delays as other lines. With respect to the last, I may say that Mr. Brydges is still employed by the Government.

SUPREME COURT BILL.

In reply to Mr. Blake, Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Government had under consideration the subject of introducing during the present Session, a measure for the creation of a Supreme Court.

CLERGY RESERVES.

Mr. THOMPSON (Ontario)—Asked when the remainder of the return to an Address, of 25th of April last, as to the amount accrued from the sales of the Clergy Reserves in Upper Canada, since the Act 18 Vict., Chap. 2, a statement of amounts paid each municipality annually, in Upper Canada, and the amounts now due to them respectively, under the authority thereof, will be laid before the House.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that return will be sent down very shortly.

PATENT ACT.

In reply to Mr. Oliver, Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said it was not the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce a Bill to amend the Patent Act.

POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. DELORME asked whether the Government intend during this Session to bring down any measure for the abolition of Post-

age on newspapers published in Canada, and sent to subscribers in Canada?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD replied that it was not the intention of the Government, this Session, to bring down any such measure. The revenue of the Post Office Department had been considerably diminished by the reduction in the rates of postage, the Government did not feel themselves in a position to make any further reductions.

THE FAMINE IN FRANCE.

Mr. FOURNIER—Whether it is the intention of the Government to ask for an appropriation in aid of those who are suffering from the famine caused by the disastrous war which has desolated France?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD replied, that this was a subject which had been under the consideration of the Government for some time. Some weeks before the fall of Paris, the subject had been brought before Government as one of interest not only to Canada, but to the whole world—it was now of world-wide interest. The Government did not propose to ask this House to vote any money for the purpose, but as far as in their power lay, they would follow the example set by Her Majesty's Government in England and by the Government of the United States. The Government in England had put the whole transport service at the disposal of the people of England for the transportation of the most munificent contributions they were now sending to the relief of the suffering people of France. It was the intention of the Canadian Government, with the consent of Parliament, to ask for aid in the transmission of any contributions from any part of Canada for the purpose.

BAY VERTE CANAL.

Mr. BURPEE asked whether the surveys and report of the same, of the proposed Canal between the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy (so important to the trade of the Dominion) will be completed in time to admit of its being laid before this House at its present Session?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—The survey is not yet completed. The surveying and engineering party is expected back about the 10th of next month, and we hope to be able to obtain their report in time to submit it to the House before the end of the Session.

WITHDRAWAL OF TWENTY CENT COINS.

Mr. CHEVAL asked whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt such

measures as may appear to them expedient, to withdraw from circulation the silver twenty cent coins, which are a nuisance to the public, as we have now in circulation twenty-five cent coins?

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS replied that the Government had taken the only steps it was possible for them to take with regard to the withdrawal of these twenty cent pieces from circulation. He might observe that when it became necessary to get an additional supply of small silver coin, this subject engaged the attention of the Government, and they were of opinion that the twenty-five cent coin was the best to circulate, and they were fully sensible of the disadvantage of having two coins in circulation so similar in appearance and so nearly alike in value. It was deemed advisable, however, to go on with the issue of the twenty-five cent coins, because there happened to be but a small amount of twenty cent coins in circulation. The banks were instructed to accept them and never to re-issue them, and, therefore, it depended on the public to have them withdrawn. He was very glad to have this opportunity to state, that the Government were as desirous as they could possibly be to co-operate in every way with the banks in withdrawing these twenty cent coins from circulation.

THE FISHERIES, &c

In reply to a question from Hon. Sir A. T. GALT, respecting his motion on the paper, for correspondence between the Dominion and the Imperial Governments since the 1st of February, 1870, on the fisheries and the proposed International Commission.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that there was little to relate on these subjects at present. The correspondence brought down showed that a Commission was asked for, for a specified purpose, by the Canadian Government, in regard to the Fisheries. The Imperial Government promised to communicate with the United States Government on the subject, and did so, with the result all were aware of. The changes subsequently adopted at the instance of both Governments were already known. Nothing beyond the letters between the ministers of London and Washington could be produced at present.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT complained they had not got any correspondence since Earl Kimberley's report, and little after the date of 1866. However, the matter was coming up to-morrow.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—Yes.

Mr. Cheval.

THE INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES moved for a return of the names of persons who have tendered for contracts on the Intercolonial Railway since the 19th of May, 1869. He said his object was to gratify the public expectation. The general impression throughout the country was that there was a great, reckless expenditure connected with this undertaking, that incompetency as well as extravagance were the order of the day (laughter and cheers). The expenditure in connection with this railway was enormous a few years ago, but in 1870 it exceeded all preceding years, being for engineers and so forth \$306,681. He moved for details as to the letting of all the contracts since the 19th May, 1869, the salaries of employees on the road, and other information in regard to it, including the rates per mile of the different contracts.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said a large portion of the information asked for was already before the House. The rest would be brought down.

THE PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. BLAKE moved for correspondence between the Canadian and Quebec and Ontario Governments, touching the Provincial arbitration and award.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU hoped the hon. gentleman would amend his motion so as to make it include a copy of the joint address of both Houses of the Local Legislature of Quebec to the Governor General on this subject. The address was a very strong protest against the award being considered as anything but one illegal and unjust.

Mr. GODIN moved in amendment to strike out all the words after the word "award" in the main motion, so as to imply a disavowal of confidence in the decision.

Mr. FOURNIER moved in amendment to the amendment, the following addition, assuming the excision of the latter portion of Mr. Blake's motion, "and that the following words be substituted in their stead. And representing "to His Excellency that in the opinion "of this House the question relative to "the division of the debt between the "Provinces of Ontario and Quebec having "been submitted to and adjudicated upon "by two arbitrators, only one appointed "by the Dominion Government and the "other by the Government of Ontario, in the absence of the arbitrator appointed by the Government "of Quebec, their award is not binding upon the respective Provinces." He said that he desired on that occasion to register his protest against this award.

The Province of Quebec was unanimously against this award. All lawyers knew that when arbitrators were appointed, the presence of all at the hearing of the case was essential to any valid award. He went further, believing, with the Quebec Premier, that the award, too, should be unanimous. It was for Ontario to adopt any possible violation of the present difficulty (hear hear.)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not take any action in the matter at present, of the kind asked by the amendments, or any affirming the validity or invalidity of the award. But the Government had no objection to bring down all the papers, including those asked for by the Premier of Quebec. The amendments were premature. The House did not officially know that the award was the decision of the Arbitrators. The papers must be put on the table. The best mode of dealing with this subject was to excise from the main motion its last part, leaving the matter to be considered after the submission of the papers.

Mr. JOLY said it was well known that on four different dates, the Government of Quebec protested against the decision of the arbitrators, and had more than once notified His Excellency of the resignation of the Quebec representative. In no case was anything more than a merely formal reply vouchsafed. Either the Federal Government had or had not the right to interfere. If it had, the subject was sufficiently important to call for their interference, if they had a proper regard for the peace, welfare and good-understanding between the Provinces that composed the Dominion, and the Federal Government ought, if not to interfere, (in case of a doubt as to its power), at least, to suspend the proceedings; and if it could do neither, it should now show that it would at least attempt to do so. But they had throughout shown a lack of interest in the matter. He protested against the course which the Dominion Government had taken in this matter. A course which, certainly, whatever might be their powers, was calculated to lead to difficulties.

Mr. BLAKE was satisfied that if the question were found to be within the province of this House, and if they had power to deal with it, they would do so in the most impartial manner. He could not agree with his honourable friend's motion on this simple ground, that he believed this House, independent of the law, had no right to deal with this question. However desirable, or undesirable it might be, they had not the power to do so, and should not attempt it. For that reason his honourable friend's motion was one

which should not receive the assent of the House. He could not agree that the latter part of his motion should be excised, and if the honourable member was determined to have it done, it must be by the decision of a majority of this House. Under the circumstances of the case, it was the duty of the Government, as far as necessary for the adjustment of the debt, to assume that the decision of the arbitrators was valid until it should be decided to be otherwise, and they should have the financial arrangements based on that award, and he would not agree to have it refused unless by a majority of the House.

Hon. Mr. DORION could not agree with his hon. friend that this was a matter with which the House had no power to deal. By them the arbitrators were appointed, and they had a right to say whether their award was right or not. This was, in fact, their plain duty, and they should either ratify or annul the decision of the arbitrators. He believed it was illegal for two of the arbitrators to come to a decision in the absence of the third, and he thought the Government were deserving of censure for the lack of interest which they had displayed in the matter. If they would not do their duty, it remained for the House to take up the question, and settle it at the earliest moment possible. It was of the highest importance to the Dominion at large that it should be settled before the approaching elections.

Mr. MAGILL said the cause of the absence of Judge Day was simply his inability to get the other two arbitrators to agree with him. If he could have done that, there would have been no difficulty at all. It was a question of law, and this House had no power to deal with it.

Mr. HARRISON agreed with the previous speaker, that this House had no power to adjudicate on the question. If the House could constitute themselves a bench of judges, they could not be said to be quite impartial. Some of them must be advocates as well as judges. He objected to having this matter sprung on the House without notice, and to discussing it at all until the papers were brought down.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU said he was ready to defend here what was done in the Quebec Legislature; but the members for Bellechasse and Hochelaga should not propose or try to do here what was not done in that Legislature. It was unjust to bring up and try to secure a decision or action upon the merits of the question, without previous notice, or the submission of the papers. The award was illegal and unjust, and Lower Canada would never submit to it. It was

not only a legal but a political question, for upon its decision depended the stability of Confederation (hear, hear). He would vote against the motion of the member for Bellechasse. The Dominion Government are bound to act upon this arbitration question; for the subsidy payment would be based on some view of the question. He would go further than the member for Hochelaga, and say Quebec would not submit to an unjust award from any human authority (hear, hear, and ironical cheers). He repeated that sentiment, and affirmed that Quebec was unanimous on this point.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER—Yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU would vote against the amendment of the member for Bellechasse because it was premature. He would vote for the motion of the member for Joliette, because it would do away with the objectionable part of the motion of the member for Durham.

Mr. GEOFFRION said the objections of the Premier of Quebec would have some force, if the question were a decision upon the events of the arbitration. The amendments were not premature. Information was not so much needed as pretended, for everybody, even so far North and West as Manitoba, knew the manner in which the decision was rendered. The simple question was, as to the legality or illegality of that decision. After all the information elicited on this subject, the Dominion Ministers were unready to pronounce an opinion on the subject. He believed the decision illegal, and was ready to proceed with it at once, though so many other Quebec members were without any opinions thereon.

Mr. JOSEPH DUFRESNE replied to the charge of unreadiness directed against himself and other Quebec members. He was ready with his opinion, but other members were not, and preferred waiting for a better opportunity of expressing it, namely: when all the papers were brought down, and all the members were in possession of the facts.

Mr. GEOFFRION suggested to the hon. gentlemen an accommodation of their differences. Let him ask the member for Bellechasse to let his motion stand for the present, and he would probably do it.

Mr. DUFRESNE—Let him do it then.

Hon. Dr. BEAUBIEN criticised and condemned the amendment of the member for Bellechasse, and argued in favour of the suspension of judgment and action on this question till all the papers were before the House.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE hoped his hon. friend, after he had heard this discussion, would

Hon. Mr. Chauveau.

withdraw his motion and re-introduce it at some more opportune time. Apart from the reasons given against the introduction of the amendment by the hon. member for Bellechasse, he thought it was hardly fair to ask this House to pronounce an opinion on the question, without any notice whatever having been given, and introducing it too, we might add, as a surprise to a motion which no one would have supposed would have led to an amendment of the kind. The motion was an unusual one, and was rarely tolerated by the House. He was far from admitting that this House was competent to settle the question at all—that it was the proper tribunal. He was certain even the movers of the amendments would not quietly submit to an expression of opinion upon a substantive motion contrary to the spirit of theirs. An appeal from a decision of this Parliament, considered unjust by Quebec, would doubtless be sought.

Hon. Mr. DORION—What is the proper tribunal?

Hon. Mr. IRVINE was not called upon to decide; he was merely speaking as to the improper tribunal. (Hear, hear.) He did not deny that an expression of the opinion of this House might be in order. So far as the award was to be acted upon by the Dominion Government—so far as they might have to treat it as legal or illegal—they would have to be responsible to this House for their action, and the House would pronounce upon it. He agreed with the amendments of the member for Joliette. They should certainly support the amendment to the motion of that hon. gentleman, so as to exempt the House from the expression of any premature opinion on the merits of the question. They should not ask the Government in any way to act on the award at present. He did not admit it was valid, nor did he believe any part of it should be recognised or treated by this House as legal. He hoped the hon. member for Bellechasse would consent to withdraw his amendment, which he must see could not possibly carry. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET argued that the motion was not at present in proper form, as it appealed to a House at present ill-informed, and it would be a great deal more prudent and in order if the hon. member for Bellechasse would withdraw his motion.

Mr. FOURNIER rejected the idea, that want of information was any defence for the unreadiness of the hon. members to proceed with this question at present. Every one in this House was well aware how the case stood at present. All the

facts had been made public in both Provinces. He was certainly determined to obtain an expression of the opinion of the House on his motion. The question was not as to the merits of the arbitration, but as to whether a tribunal composed of three arbitrators could render a decision in the absence of one of the three, and whether the decision so rendered could be valid. He would not withdraw his motion, but he would not object to an adjournment of the debate if the House desired it.

The debate was adjourned, and the House rose at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 24, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

MESSAGE.

A message was received from the House of Commons informing the Senate of the appointment of a Committee to act as a Joint Committee respecting the Library of Parliament.

NEW MEMBER.

Hon. Mr. CHURCHILL was introduced by Hon. Messrs. Mitchell and Miller, and took the customary oath.

PETITIONS.

Petitions were presented from the Montreal and Quebec branches of the Bible Society, praying for the abolition of the duty on Bibles imported by the Society.

COMMITTEES.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON presented the first report of the Committee on Banking, Commerce, and Railways, asking that the quorum be reduced to nine. Motion for adoption of report carried.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented the first Report of the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, asking that the quorum be reduced to seven. The motion was carried for the adoption of the report.

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REPORT.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL presented the annual report of the Post Office Department for 1870.

LEGISLATIVE PRINTING.

A message was received from the House of Commons informing the Senate of the

appointment of a committee to act as a Joint Committee on the Legislative Printing.

THE ARBITRATION BETWEEN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER said that the motion which he was now about to make, directed the attention of the House to a matter of very great importance, namely: the arbitration between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. A feeling now prevailed throughout the Province of Quebec that a great injustice had been done to that section of the Dominion by the award of the arbitrators appointed under the British North America Act. The amount at stake was very large indeed, and if those who had studied the question had made a correct calculation, the Province of Quebec would have to pay ten or twelve millions of dollars according to that award, whereas she was not justly bound to do so. The award was in favour of another Province which would receive the benefit of the amount which was taken away from Quebec. Instead of a division of the debts and assets which would give on any basis of population or any other fixed and equitable principle something like one half of those debts and assets to each Province, there was actually a difference of seven or eight millions made in favour of Ontario as against the Province of Quebec. If such were the case, no one could deny that a great injustice had been inflicted upon Quebec, or fail to understand why the people of that section felt so aggrieved. The results of such a sentiment might lead to very grave public inconveniences. The Confederation of the Provinces had been necessitated to a large extent by the state of things which existed between Upper and Lower Canada previously. Every one knew that parties were so closely divided that government became impracticable, and it was one of the objects of Confederation to remove all causes of discontent between Upper and Lower Canada. The system of Confederation had, so far, equalled the anticipations of its promoters—the results had been most satisfactory to all sections; and it would certainly be very unfortunate were the prospects of the harmonious working of the union to be marred by any untoward causes arising at the present time. Now, when it was known that such dissatisfaction prevailed in Quebec—that both branches of the Legislature complained unanimously of an injustice that had been done to that section, and asked that that award be set aside—the House should earnestly consider what was best to be done to remedy

a difficulty which might assume most dangerous proportions. What was the proper remedy it was not for him to say, but all must agree with him as to the necessity of convincing the people of Quebec that the Parliament of the Dominion would not be a party to perpetuating any injustice. He (Hon. Mr. Tessier) for one believed that there was patriotism enough in the Province of Ontario to refuse to sanction injustice to any Province. The representatives of the Maritime Provinces might not be so deeply interested in the question as Ontario or Quebec, but nevertheless they were equally interested in the harmony of the Union, and would not fail to consider the question in the interests of the whole Dominion. If it could be shown that there were real and palpable errors in the proceedings of the arbitrators, he had no doubt that some remedy would be found on reference to some higher authority. It was to be regretted that the intentions of those who framed the clause in the Confederation Act, bearing on the question, had not been more clearly defined. The only clause in the British North America Act, referring to the question was the 142nd, viz: "The division and adjustment of the debts, credits, liabilities, properties and assets of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, shall be referred to the arbitration of three arbitrators, one chosen by the Government of Quebec, one by the Government of Ontario and one by the Government of Canada; and the selection of the arbitrators shall not be made until the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec have met, and the arbitrator chosen by the Government of Canada shall not be a resident either in Ontario or Quebec." If that reference was compared with other references in similar cases, it would be found that unanimity was meant, and that in cases where the majority of arbitrators could decide, the reference was construed differently. In that clause there was no mention made of an umpire. In any arbitration, whether for public or private purposes, where it was necessary that a majority should decide, it was mentioned in the convention that one of the arbitrators should act as an umpire. So far as the clause went, the three arbitrators were treated alike—as equal in power and authority; and when reference was made to the arbitrator, not resident in Ontario or Quebec, he was styled "arbitrator" simply, not "umpire." By reference to the Treaty of Ghent, in 1814, it would be seen that Commissioners were appointed to fix the boundaries of the respective countries interested. The Commissioners were to meet at St. Andrew's, New Brunswick, and if they should agree their decision was to be "final and conclusive," but in the

event of the two Commissioners differing upon all or any of the matters referred to them, or in the event of both or either of the said Commissioners refusing, or declining, or willfully omitting to act as such, "they were to make joint or separate reports, stating the grounds of their opinions; and then the British and American Governments agreed to refer the reports to some friendly Power or State, to be then named for that purpose, and who shall be requested to decide on the differences." Then, again, reference might be made to the Canada Trade Act, Imperial Statute 3rd Geo. IV, ch. 119, intended to settle certain difficulties of Trade, as connected with the levying of duties, between Upper and Lower Canada. Here it was provided that Commissioners should be appointed as well as an umpire in case of difficulty. Again, reference might be made to the Commission for the arrangement of the Oregon question in 1863; an umpire was also to be appointed in case of a difference of opinion. At the present time, there was a High Commission about to sit at Washington; and, in that case, unanimity must prevail, if its decision was to be final and conclusive. It would be seen how peculiar was the position of the three arbitrators in question. If they had come to different conclusions, would each have made a separate report? Would each of those reports, in that case, have prevailed? No provision, in fact, was made for an umpire to decide, in the British North America Act. But he could go further and say that, the arbitrators did actually differ from each other, as to the particular basis to be adopted for the division of the debts and assets. The arbitrators had a very important duty to perform, and so far as the arbitrator for Ontario was concerned, he had the confidence of his section of the Dominion, and of the whole Confederation as well (hear, hear). That hon. gentleman was well qualified to perform the duties entrusted to him. If any thing could be brought to his charge, it would only be as Tallyrand said to his ambassadors "*pas trop de zèle*," not too much zeal. He had worked patriotically for his section, and had succeeded so well as to obtain an award giving Ontario more than had been previously claimed for her by her advocates. As respects the arbitrator for Quebec, his reputation had been won at the bar and on the bench, and stood deservedly high throughout the Province. The people of Quebec felt that their interests were secure whilst he remained on the arbitration. But the appointment made by the Dominion was not so fortunate. If some gentleman of high standing had been chosen out of the

Hon. Mr. Tessier.

Dominion, in Great Britain for instance, it would have certainly given more satisfaction, to all sections of the Confederation. The gentleman who was actually appointed might have been supposed to be competent at the time, but it was to be confessed that one circumstance had the effect of shaking that confidence reposed in him at the outset. It was to be regretted that he had accepted subordinate employment in one of the departments of the Government of the Confederation, and thereby lessened confidence in him. He (Mr. Tessier) had no doubt that gentleman acted conscientiously, but it was certainly notorious that the fact of his remaining in the arbitration and assisting in doing some other work for the Dominion Government was not viewed with satisfaction in Quebec, nor even in Ontario. Now, it appeared from the printed opinions of the arbitrators that they did not agree in opinion. For instance, Hon. Mr. MacPherson said: "On the whole, it is with the utmost confidence submitted that the ratio deduced from population, as ascertained by the Census of 1861, is, of all modes suggested, the most just; for when liabilities have to be laid upon a whole people, who possess so equally the means of paying as the people of Ontario and Quebec, what can be more equitable than to distribute them *per capita*." On the other hand, Hon. J. H. Gray declared: "A division according to population certainly seems the simplest, and is undoubtedly the most expeditious mode; but from the arguments advanced up to this time, *I do not see my way clear*, in the absence of any agreement between the representatives of Ontario and Quebec, to adopt it. It has been argued it would not be just or fair—it may be added, *perhaps it might be practically impossible*." Those were the opinions of the two arbitrators as to the basis of division, and it could be seen that they were entirely at variance. Lest he might be charged with asserting too much respecting the feeling in the Province of Quebec, as he only wished to state what was perfectly correct he would refer to the resolutions proposed and unanimously adopted in the month of November last, by both the branches of the Legislature of Quebec. Those resolutions declared:

"That the injustice of the said pretended award is evident from the same having been rendered wholly in the interest of the Province of Ontario, and from the fact that while Messrs. Gray and MacPherson refused to take into consideration the relative financial positions of the two Provinces at the time of the Union, they have taken into consideration the object and nature of certain items of expenditure as

having been incurred in one or the other section of the Province of Canada from the period of the Union to Confederation; that the said pretended award is further unjust, inasmuch as the division of the credits, properties and assets of the late Province of Canada does not even proceed upon the same basis and principles as those which appear to have been adopted in relation to the division of the balance of the debt, and does not rest upon any principle whatsoever, but is purely arbitrary and favours the Province of Ontario."

On that occasion the hon. gentleman who acts as Treasurer of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Robertson made some lengthy remarks, in the course of which he said: "By the present award the debt of Quebec was put at \$5,006,327 and Ontario at \$5,593,673, the latter half a million less than she admitted owing, and the former many hundred thousands more than she was convinced was right. Quebec took the ground that the old Upper Canada debt should be taken off the common debt of ten millions and a half, and the balance divided between her and Ontario, on such principle as might be decided upon by the Arbitrators. In dividing the assets, Quebec had been awarded only about \$4,000,000, and Ontario, \$14,000,000." If such were the case, as there stated, then he was sure a feeling of indignation would arise even in the Province of Ontario, to set aside the award. When Nova Scotia complained that an injustice had been done her, the Parliament of Canada came forward and remedied the injustice. Every disposition had been shown to conciliate all sections of British America, and bring them into the Confederation; and under those circumstances he had no doubt that the claims of Quebec would receive all the consideration to which they were entitled. Now as respects the legal point, he would say that it was an understood principle between private individuals, between corporations as well as countries, that a proper consent must be given. The province of Quebec took only its existence by the Confederation Act, and could not strictly be said to have been a party consenting to that reference to arbitrators mentioned in the said Act. We had yet to learn what rules were adopted for the adjudication of the questions at issue. None apparently were adopted when one of the arbitrators resigned. The two remaining arbitrators had no jurisdiction to proceed in the absence of the other. This was a well settled doctrine. See Domats Civil Law by Cushing vol. I, No. 1110. "Arbitrators cannot judge unless they are all together." Another reason which made the award so unsatisfactory, was the fact that the arbi-

trators refused to admit the claims which were properly raised by Quebec. Upper Canada, at the time of the Union, had a debt of \$6,000,000, whilst Lower Canada had actually a sum to her credit. The arbitrators refused to enter into the consideration of that claim, and why? They argued because the Union Act had been brought forward on high political grounds. If those grounds existed in 1840, when this country had not the benefit of responsible Government—when it was not supposed that equal justice was to be meted out to all portions of the Provinces, was the same maxim to prevail now? He hoped that there was not a feeling in the Confederation, that would “on high political grounds,” make the Province of Quebec pay ten millions whilst a sister Province would only pay half. On the contrary, if an injustice was committed formerly, there was no reason to perpetuate it, or make the injury now actually greater than the first.

Mr. Justice Day expressed himself at page 22 of his pamphlet as follows:

“It is matter of history that Upper Canada, whatever her undeveloped resources may have been, was in a condition of great financial embarrassment, in 1841, and it is not too much to say that she was rescued from a calamitous crisis by the union with Lower Canada.”

It was stated in the life of Lord Sydenham, pp. 123-4, upon the authority of the Parliamentary papers of 1840, that:

“In the summer of 1839, Upper Canada was on the eve of bankruptcy, with an annual revenue of not more than £78,000. The charge for the interest of its debt was £65,000, and the permanent expense of its Government £55,000 more, leaving an annual deficiency of £42,000 while the want of a seaport deprived it of the power of increasing its revenue in the usual and least onerous way by the imposition of duties * * * and the ruinous expedient which had been adopted of late of paying the interest of the public debt out of fresh loans could no longer be repeated.”

The Imperial Government to help Upper Canada out of the “condition in which it was impossible to continue,” brought about the union of Upper Canada and Lower Canada.

And again Lord Sydenham in his letters of 20th November and 8th December, 1839, pp. 144, 150, says:

“The finances are more deranged than we believed even in England. The deficit £75,000 a year, more than equal to the income. All public works suspended.

Hon. Mr. Tessier.

“Emigration going on fast from the Province. Every man's property worth only half what it was. The Union offered the only means of recruiting its finances by persuading Great Britain to help the Upper Canada Exchequer.”

The foregoing extracts, to which others equally strong might easily be added, shew how urgent the necessity was, from which the Union relieved the Upper Province.

The true rule to have adopted was to give every one his due—we should not take from one man to give to another. That rule which prevailed between individuals should hold good in the case of nations or sections of countries. But it might be said that there was a partnership in fact, and that we should have to consider the position of the two Provinces, since the union, and particularly the fact that Quebec had derived larger advantages than Ontario from the union. Now, looking at the facts, he held an opinion directly the reverse. The Province of Upper Canada, in 1841, had a population of 465,000 souls, and Lower Canada 663,000. Ten years afterwards, in 1851, Upper Canada had increased her population to 952,000, while that of Lower Canada was 890,000 or 62,000 less than that of the sister Province. Was the increase the result of natural growth? No, it was brought about by Immigration, stimulated by the expenditure of large sums of public money in the construction of Public Works in Upper Canada. It was urged that the Public Works were beneficial to Lower Canada. He admitted that to be the case, but at the same time they had been doubly advantageous to Upper Canada. It was well known that the Union between Upper and Lower Canada was, in some degree, practically carried out as a Federal Union. Nothing was given to Upper Canada, unless some equivalent was made to Lower Canada, and *vice versa*. Gentlemen from Ontario knew full well that they benefitted largely? with Lower Canada. In 1861 the population of Ontario had increased to 1,396,091, while that of Quebec was 1,111,506. Now the partnership had been dissolved. Upper Canada was in the enjoyment of a large surplus, instead of the debt with which she entered into the union in 1841. Lower Canada, on the other hand, was saddled with the larger proportion of the debt, and received no compensation for the liabilities which she had paid at the time of the Union. He would only cite two instances of the mode in which the assets were divided. For example, looking at the award, he found the Montreal Turnpike Trust, \$188,000, was placed among the assets given to Quebec. Now the fact was that amount was actually a

liability thrown upon the Province of Quebec. The arbitrators themselves acknowledged as much, for they said: "Whereas the said sum is secured by debentures issued upon the credit of the said Trust, and guaranteed by the late Province of Canada. * * * * * Now, therefore the said arbitrators having assigned the said Trust as an asset to the Province of Quebec, we hereby adjudge and award that the said Province shall hereafter indemnify, protect, and save harmless the said Dominion, and the said Province of Ontario against any charge upon or payment by the said Dominion, in respect of the said debentures, or the said guarantee, or in respect in any other way of the said trust." And again in the division of the assets, there was another item, the Municipal Loan Fund of Upper Canada, amounting to \$7,000,000, and it was handed over to Ontario. On the other hand the Municipal Loan Fund of Lower Canada, some two or three millions, was awarded to Quebec. Now that Municipal Loan Fund was actually a joint property of the Canadas, and could not be awarded in the mode proposed without an injustice to Quebec. It might be more convenient to Ontario to receive the \$7,000,000 in its own Province, but justice rather than convenience should be considered in such cases. The Municipal Loan Fund was actually taken from the public chest of Canada—it belonged to Lower as well as Upper Canada. Yet, seven millions were given to one, and only two or three to the other. In whatever light the award was considered, its injustice was evident. It was a nullity to all intents and purpose. There was a want of jurisdiction—it was not binding on any one party. Three arbitrators were appointed, and all must be present at the award, but in the present case, one resigned. All that the arbitrators had to do was to report the fact to the proper quarter—the Dominion Government. Suppose one of the arbitrators died or became incapacitated, could the arbitrators proceed? If they did, their award would be a nullity. The proper course then to pursue would be for the two arbitrators to report the facts, and the higher authority would notify the party who had the right to appoint another arbitrator. In the case in question, however, the judgment was given before the Province of Quebec had even time to appoint another arbitrator in place of Judge Day. That selection could not be made hastily—even if it were not made for months, the delay in a matter of such importance would not be improper. If the arbitrators had been less hasty, he was sure that the errors of fact, found in the award, would not have occurred.

Again, it was urged against one of the arbitrators, that whilst the Confederation Act stated positively that he must not be a resident of either Ontario or Quebec, the fact was that he had been residing in Ottawa for some time. It was a question of domicile, a question of fact to be ascertained. If he still kept up an establishment in St. John, with his servants therein, then the case would be different. Certainly, enquiry should have been made into a matter so intimately affecting the validity of the award; but none such was ever instituted. Who could decide upon this disqualification, not Mr. Gray himself, but Mr. Day had resigned, where was the majority of the arbitrators? The more he considered the question, the more positive he was that the award was not founded in law. Under the Union Act of 1840, when the Bill was introduced, there was a clause providing for arbitration or Commissioners, and the late Chief Justice Robinson, of Upper Canada, who wrote a pamphlet on the subject, said that in case of the death of one of the Commissioners the arbitration would be at an end, because the clause did not provide for the appointment of another. In 1814 Belgium was united to Holland, but in 1830, a revolution occurred, and a Conference was held in London to fix proper limits to the territory of the former country, and to arrange the debts and other matters affecting her. At that time a gentleman (Mr. Nothomb,) who was connected with the revolution, and subsequently became a faithful subject of King Leopold—in fact, one of the Secretaries of the Congress—wrote a book upon the facts of the case. From that work it would be seen that the opinion expressed in the Conference was that the debts of Belgium, which existed at the time of the union, in 1814, revived, as a matter of course, when the separation took place. According to the basis of arrangement each country would have to take back exclusively the debts for which it was liable before the Union. In case of a conflict of opinion between the Commissioners, the matter was to be referred to the five Great Powers of Europe. That reference was not made—the fact of its existence no doubt was sufficient to make the Commissioners agree. In conclusion, he expressed his confidence that the House would see justice done to the Province of Quebec, which naturally felt deeply aggrieved, and that even the representatives of Ontario would not accept an award based on injustice to another section. Unless a remedy were provided, difficulties might arise to threaten the harmonious working of the Union. It was most advisable that all sections of the Dominion should be satisfied with the

manner in which the Government of the country was conducted. If all sections received equal justice, everybody would be content, but if an injury was inflicted on a particular Province, discontent would necessarily be engendered. If there was a disposition shown to give that justice which was due to Quebec, then the feeling which now prevailed in that section would soon disappear, and the Confederation would necessarily grow stronger, and its people more happy and prosperous with the progress of years.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT, in seconding the motion, said that it would not be proper for him then to express any opinion with respect to the Arbitration. The fact that the Legislature of Quebec had expressed such strong opinions with respect to the award of the Arbitration, should be earnestly considered by all who wished to see the Union work satisfactorily. The House knew that the delegates met at Quebec and arranged a scheme of Union, but that it was subsequently amended in London on the representation of the Maritime Provinces. Again, at a later time, further concessions were made to Nova Scotia for the purpose of conciliating her. On the whole the Confederation was working satisfactorily, and it was very desirable that it should continue to do so.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that every one ought to approach a question of such magnitude with a disposition to treat it with fairness, and he had no doubt that the House was prepared to do so. It had been already shown that there was great unanimity on the subject in Quebec, but it might be urged that that unanimity was the result of a oneness of interest. Interest certainly had much influence on the minds of persons, but it was impossible to ignore the fact that men of all creeds and parties condemned the award as unjust to the Province. Men of intelligence and right feeling did not differ when principles of right and justice were involved. Whilst he was himself quite prepared to acknowledge the ability of the arbitrators in dealing with the subject, yet he could not help coming to the conclusion that they approached the discharge of their duties too much in the spirit of advocates, not sufficiently in the spirit of judges. All authorities on the subject of arbitrations informed us that the arbitrators should come together with the determination to agree, to get rid of all prejudices, and to discuss the question temperately and calmly, so as to arrive at a proper decision. In the present case, we found the arbitrators at variance with

each other on all points. The arbitrator from Ontario, for instance, differed entirely from the Dominion arbitrator respecting the basis of dividing the debts. Whilst he quite agreed with the eulogy pronounced upon the arbitrator for Ontario, yet he could not coincide in the assertion that it was quite competent for a gentleman acting in his capacity to consider solely the interests of Ontario. As soon as he was appointed an arbitrator, he became virtually a judge between the two Provinces. What he (Mr. Sanborn) complained of particularly was the fact that the arbitrators did not proceed on an equitable principle of division and adjustment. Prior to 1841 Upper and Lower Canada were distinct Provinces, and then they were united, but subsequently they were always in reality treated as separate. They had a distinct system of law—each had its Attorney-General and Solicitor-General—what was given to the one was generally asked for the other. It was admitted that the debt of Upper Canada at the time of the Union was something like six and a half millions, whilst Lower Canada had a considerable balance in hand. Now, we were told that the arbitrators considered nothing prior to the Union, and the reasons given for such a course were very weak. Any equitable adjustment must take into consideration the condition of things at the time of the Union, and on that account alone Quebec had every reason to complain with respect to the award. As respects the legal aspect of the question, he was of the opinion that it was not correct to treat the matter as a public arbitration. The two Provinces had interests at issue just like any two individuals would have. In this connection, the hon. gentleman referred to Russell, Caldwell and Watson on arbitration, for the purpose of shewing the scope of arbitrations, and the legal mode of carrying them on. He contended that the award of the arbitration was a nullity, since the proper conditions had not been fulfilled—the three arbitrators, for instance, not having been present when it was made; and went on to say that it was a matter of the greatest importance to the Confederation that the matter should be settled in such a manner that all ill-feeling in any section might be dispelled. He was not prepared to say how the Province of Quebec was to be relieved from the difficulty, but he trusted that justice would be done sooner or later.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he was quite sure that although his hon. friend opposite had thought fit to introduce his motion with such lengthy remarks, he would not think it strange if he (Mr. Campbell) should for the present content

himself with simply expressing the willingness of the Government to bring down all the papers in its possession.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE regretted that the hon. gentleman should have spoken so much at length in reference to a motion, merely for the production of papers. It was very unfortunate, in his opinion, that this premature discussion should have occurred, when it would all probably have to be repeated when the information asked for was regularly before the House. It was not far to surprise gentlemen in that manner, and allow a discussion all on one side to go to the country. One hon. gentleman had expressed, at the outset of his remarks, a desire to treat the question in a spite of the utmost fairness, and yet he had gone on to argue it in a spirit of partisanship.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that the discussion would do good, for it would direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the subject, and lead them to see how far the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had made the motion were justified by the facts. The people of Quebec wished that their case should be thoroughly understood, and would be deeply incensed with their representatives were they to fail to bring it fully before Parliament. In his opinion, the arbitrators had erred, and failed to do justice to Quebec. Every one knew that if a juryman absconded, when a case was under trial, any judgment the jury would then render would be null and void. On similar grounds, any decision arrived at by arbitration, whose numbers were incomplete by the resignation or death of one of its members, would be nugatory. In Quebec no difference of opinion existed with respect to the injustice of the decision—the people, irrespective of nationalities, were unanimous on that point. He regretted to see the feeling that now existed in that Province, but it would not disappear until the grievance was removed. It would be better for the Dominion Government to assume all the debts of the Provinces than to allow the difficulty to get worse. Some mode of allaying the existing dissatisfaction must certainly be found with as little delay as possible.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said that if any mistake had been committed by the Arbitrator from New Brunswick, he could assure the House it was an error of judgment, not of intention.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN said that many gentlemen certainly had reason to complain that the House had been taken by surprise, for he had not expected that the

merits of the question would have been dealt with at that stage, when the papers were only asked for. It was certainly unfortunate that an *ex parte* statement should go before the country. As respects the Arbitrators, he was sure that they had considered the question with a conscientious desire to arrive at a right solution.

The SPEAKER here stated that a telegram had just been received announcing the fact that peace had been signed at Versailles, (cheers).

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON said that the House would not, of course, expect him to enter into the merits of the question at that stage. He had to discharge a very onerous and delicate duty, and had endeavoured to do so to the best of his ability. He could assure the House that he had endeavoured to act with the utmost impartiality. If the time should come, when the whole matter could be discussed he would be prepared to vindicate the award. He did not enter upon the consideration of the question in the spirit of an advocate, but had dealt with it impartially and honestly.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER had no doubt that the Arbitrators discharged their duties conscientiously and he had not the least intention to say any thing reflecting on their personal character.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN felt the highest regard for the hon. gentleman opposite who had been acting as arbitrator. He had not used the term "advocate" offensively. What he meant was that the arbitrators had dealt with the question too argumentatively—according to too strict technical rules.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON did not find fault with the remarks of hon. gentlemen, who had, on the whole, treated him with every consideration. As respects the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick—the Dominion arbitrator—he had acted with a most conscientious desire to give a right decision. He had never seen a man more anxious to do what was right

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

A Message was received from His Excellency, thanking the House for their loyal address.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3.20 p. m.

PETITIONS.

The following petitions were presented:

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Leeds) presented the petition of H. J. Hubertus and others, praying to be incorporated to construct a railway from Toronto, through Peterboro', Madoc and Ottawa City, and across the Ottawa River into the Province of Quebec. The Company to be known as the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.

Mr. WORKMAN presented the petition of William Matheson and others in Montreal against the duties on coal, flour, &c.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act Chap-66, 31st Victoria, relating to the naturalization of aliens.

Mr. YOUNG moved to refer the returns on unforeseen expenses to the Printing Committee.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the published report of the Postmaster General for 1870.

A formal Supply Bill was granted.

The Committee rose and reported, and obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT moved the following resolutions: Resolved—That this House recognizes in the fullest manner the importance to the cause of peace and civilization, of the settlement of all questions in dispute between Great Britain and the United States. And, in the especial interests of Canada will rejoice to find the result of the Joint High Commission productive of cordial and lasting friendship between the two nations.

That this House regards the control and disposal of the inshore fisheries and the navigation of the inland waters of the Dominion, as specially within the powers conveyed to the Parliament of Canada under the British North America Act; and will view with the utmost concern and apprehension any proposal to alter or diminish the just rights of the Dominion, in these respects, without their consent.

That this House has always been, and now is, prepared to concede the most free and unrestricted use of the fisheries and inland navigation to the United States, upon receiving as an equivalent therefor complete compensation in modification of the United States commercial system, directed to the more free and liberal interchange of the products of labour in the two countries.

That the concession to the United States of the freedom of the fisheries and of the St. Lawrence, without compensation, would

Mr. Crawford.

place Canada in a most disadvantageous position for future negotiation, by depriving her of the means of offering any adequate equivalent for those concessions she is desirous of obtaining from that nation.

That the House willingly consents to the consideration by the Joint High Commission of all subjects in which Canada is concerned with the United States, and will cheerfully make any sacrifices that may be required at their hands in the interest of the Empire, so far as they do not compromise the national interests and security of this country, and directly tend to their undue subordination to the United States in the future.

He said he had never on any occasion been more strongly impressed with the gravity of the circumstances under which he addressed the House, than he was at this moment. The interests which were at stake in the negotiations now pending between Great Britain and the United States, were of the most vital character to this Dominion. Our future political existence depended on the manner in which they were settled. It was the duty of the House to strengthen the Government by every means in their power, in the protection of the interests of their country, and he was sure the Government would be glad to have the support of Parliament in carrying out the policy which they had themselves announced. There were matters connected with the appointment of the Joint High Commission, which were calculated to excite distrust in the minds of our people and rendered it necessary that the views of this House should be presented in unmistakable language. He knew that this action would imply a doubt as to the protection of the interests of this country in the negotiations now pending. He would not, however, for a moment attribute dishonourable motives to the Imperial Government. Far from it. But they were anxious for a settlement of the pending disputes and the establishment of cordial relations with the United States. Having those great ends in view, he thought they might look at our Canadian interests in these questions as of comparatively minor importance. It was a favourite idea with the Americans, that Canada should become a part of the Republic. The States would prefer, that the concessions to be made should be such as to place us in a position of subordination and inferiority. This, rather than English concessions or money payments would be particularly welcome to our neighbours. A year ago the only question of great moment between Canada and the States was, that as to our claims to indemnity for the Fenian raid. As to the Fisheries, no treaty

or national recognition was needed to confirm or establish our rights to the three mile limit. Our rights were of an international character. The fact of the Treaty being made, confirmed the Canadian national pretension on the subject. The license system avoided difficulties as to the fisheries. The causes for a failure of the license system were, and must be found, in the fact that it was not enforced. An able pamphlet recently issued, on this subject proved that statement. If the Government were unable to carry out the system of licenses or partial exclusion, *a fortiori*, it would be still more difficult to enforce a system of total exclusion. In protecting the rights of Canada, the Government would receive as cordial assistance from him as if he cordially approved of all their previous action (cheers). Our Government soon found that they could not enforce their rights respecting the three mile limit, without running the risk of losing their rights involved in the headland question. Interference of England was again invoked. Mr. Campbell had expressed the feeling of distrust in Canada, and in the Cabinet, whose members saw it was proper to express it. The papers showed that the Fisheries and Fenian raid questions were pressed, and the subject of the withdrawal of the Imperial troops. (Hon. Sir A. T. Galt here read portions of the papers recently brought down, exhibiting the representations of Mr. Campbell and the reply of Earl Kimberley. He (Hon. Sir A. T. Galt) presumed that the instructions respecting the protection of the Fisheries for the current year, which were the same as last year, were the fruit of Imperial counsel. This, however, seemed vague and not satisfactory. The reply of Earl Kimberley was as vague as it could be in the then state of affairs, binding the Imperial Government in no respect whatever. The second point was as to Fenian claims. They were very much stronger than the "Alabama" claims (cheers). The raid took place in a time of peace, and when no causes existed here to give it a shadow of excuse. The drilling and preparations, moreover, were carried on in broad daylight. The "Alabama" escaped by stealth. What comparison was there between the two cases? The "Alabama" case was a single one, but we have had these raids from year to year. Properly, then, Mr. Campbell was urged to press these claims for indemnity for the past and security for the future. Under those circumstances, the language of the Imperial Government should have been plain and distinct. (He read Earl Kimberley's despatch to show how the reply contrasted with what might

have been looked for.) The House and the country would learn with surprise that Canadian remonstrances had not been productive of any British remonstrances with the United States Government. All that was done was, a demand for a bill of the losses by those outrages; and we were required not to present our claims in any way calculated to hurt the feelings of our neighbours. No man in Canada needed this warning. Suffering as we had suffered in those cases, we might have expected a more sympathetic and useful response than we had received from the Imperial authorities. Then as to the withdrawal of the military, little consideration had been shown our feelings, if not our interests, in the matter. The action taken had been characterised by great haste and precipitancy. In the Canadian appeal preferred by Mr. Campbell, a cordial and friendly answer might have been given. The language of the Earl was of a wholly different character. After reciting the language of that nobleman, to the effect that the Imperial Government's decision as to the withdrawal of troops would not be departed from, he said he only adverted to this subject now because it formed part of Mr. Campbell's mission. The language of that Government had a most important bearing upon our present position. Unless the House expressed some opinion in this matter, we should be assumed to be perfectly satisfied with the measure of support indicated in the English despatches. The correspondence was unsatisfactory, and the mission of Mr. Campbell, so far as eliciting any promise of Imperial support and encouragement a failure. With respect to the fishery question, and despatch of Oct. 10th, 1870, we found the proposal for a Commission to settle disputed points as to fishery limits, came from Mr. Adams when Minister to England in 1866. The object was to remove doubts as to geographical limits, within which Americans had a right to fish. The proposal remained in abeyance till Mr. Campbell went to England. The Order in Council giving him authority to proceed thither, said nothing about a Commission. He was glad to think our Government did not propose it, because we claimed a right and professed certainty upon it, and could not properly have put our pretensions in doubt. It was for Americans to propose a Commission, and, fortunately for us, they were first to do it (cheers). Notwithstanding the proposition of the Imperial Government for a joint Commission to settle the fishery limits, it was intended to be of a practical kind, with the object of settling what was fair and just between both nations. Considering the absence of complaints, and correspondence on the part of the

United States respecting the Fisheries, President Grant's accusations on the subject in his Message, startled the whole Dominion. We might have assumed that the United States Government would have inquired in regard to the supposed Canadian abuse of Fishery rights. No communications with our Government took place. The first thing we heard of the matter was through newspaper paragraphs, that the subject of the Fisheries was being discussed at Washington. The Canadian Government papers, in good faith doubtless, denied the stories, but they were correct. Up to the 10th of February, the Imperial Government communicated with the Canadian Government on the negotiations. Afterwards, however, the British Ministers entirely ignored our Government. With regard to the reference in the Queen's speech of the possibility of individual indiscretions in relation to the Fisheries, and warning against our deprecating them, unless there was some concession respecting the three mile right contemplated. Individual indiscretions would be as likely to occur after the decision of the Commission as they are at present. Canada had an undoubted right to this limit, and if the exercise of her authority could be construed into improprieties or indiscretions, we should know it. He doubted if the Canadian Government had any information as to the Commission further than the Thornton-Fish correspondence. He censured the extension of the Commission, which was at first designed to settle the headland question. His object in this motion was to strengthen the hands of the Government—not to weaken them. He did not desire to censure the Imperial Government or accuse it of any intention to sacrifice our rights. But he believed the mixing up of Canadian with Imperial questions in this Commission would be disadvantageous to us. Both sets of questions should have been kept separate. The fisheries were of paramount importance to us. They meant an important source of employment and trade to us, and a field for the training up of seamen. They have intrinsic merits also. They constituted valuable means of commercial exchange with the United States—means of securing useful trading equivalents from our neighbours. It was the way we dealt with the fisheries and navigation of the St. Lawrence upon which depended our future advantage and superiority with the United States in negotiating any commercial convention. If we made an improper use of them—if we lost those advantages—we should be placed in a position of inferiority, having nothing to offer for enviable opportunities. He vindicated the manner

Hon. Sir. A. T. Galt.

in which Canada had discharged her neighbourly obligations towards the United States during the last war. We were always ready, and are still, to treat with them on fair terms. We always offered them coveted facilities for a reasonable return. There was no reason why our claims and interests should have been exposed to injury by union with British questions, on which Britain's position was not near so strong as was ours. Then, he proposed to introduce a few short resolutions referring to the matters in dispute between Canada and the United States, which were distinct from the questions pending between Great Britain and the Republic. It was important that we should make no concessions which would sacrifice our rights. There were certain things which this country could not lose. The House would agree with him in believing that the concessions that would be demanded by the United States would, if granted, place us in a position of inferiority. The Imperial Government would, no doubt, be asked to transfer this country to the United States. He for one repudiated the idea that this country was in any way subordinate, or that it should ever be subordinated to the policy of the United States (cheers). He had only one object in view, a desire to maintain the connection with Great Britain as long as it could be maintained with reference to the honour and interests of the two countries, and when the time should come that that connexion was to cease, he desired that the people of Canada should not be placed in any position of inferiority to the Great Republic to the South of us. He declared to hold in our hands those great interests which would go, hereafter, to build up an empire on this continent (cheer). He desired that we should not lightly part with them, that they should be kept intact in the hands of this Dominion, and it was by maintaining our rights and not consenting to any weak concession on this point, but by a firm assertion of what we believed to be the rights of this country and maintaining them, that we should best protect ourselves from what he believed to be the somewhat dangerous position in which we now stood (cheers).

Hon. Sir J. A. MACDONALD expressed his pleasure at the intimation of the hon. gentleman, that his motion was not one hostile to the Government. He was certain he occupied too high a position in the politics of the country, and as a statesman, to say otherwise than he thought, or shrink from any proper responsibility. No doubt, he believed, the passage of his motion would strengthen the hands of the Government and of himself (Sir John) as a

member of the Commission. (Hear, hear.) But he did not believe it would strengthen their hands, to give the Government and people of the United States, reason to believe that they entertained any distrust of the Mother Country, (cheers,) that they feared she could think for a moment of sacrificing the interests of Canada. (Renewed cheers.) They should avoid any expression of distrust. He could not join in it, being satisfied of the truth and loyalty of England, in the larger sense of the word, towards us. (Hear, hear.) He was satisfied of the honour of the statesmen of England, and that they would not, for any consideration of peace or the quiet settlement of any of the questions between their country and the United States, sacrifice the interests of the people of Canada. He was convinced, that if any Government were base enough to propose such a course, it would be repudiated and rejected with disdain by the British people. He had no fear that the pledges given, by Government after Government, would be broken. If there was a country in the world, or a Government in the world that had always kept its pledges, carried out its engagements and enforced its treaties—no matter at what sacrifice—it was that of England. (Cheers.) They were not going to betray us now; and why should we, by any act or expression, inform the people of the United States that we were so distrustful of the honour of England, of her protection—were so convinced of the great danger of being sacrificed, as to weaken the hands of the Commission—or to show there was a division between Canada and England in sentiment and feeling? Why show the United States the fissure through which the entering wedge of severance could be put? He was not aware of any cause to distrust the Government and people of England. The honourable gentleman was a member of the Government in 1865, and of the deputation to England, and was then as satisfied as his colleagues of the assurances of Lord Palmerston's Cabinet, that in the case of war, we should be defended by land and sea with the whole force of the Empire. Had there been any change since? The Government they had met, day after day, for consultation, comprised the present Premier, Mr. Gladstone, Earl de Grey, Mr. Cardwell, and Earl Somerset, men of the existing Cabinet. Could they be suspected of infidelity to their previous pledges, or of conduct lowering to the dignity and honour of England? For what? For fear of war? Did we not lately see England rise as one man at the threat of interference with the independence of Belgium? And was she, so willing to run the risk of

a great continental war to keep her engagements towards Belgium, likely to betray her own child, the country she was bound by every tie to protect with all her power, to the last man and the last shilling? In order to lay the basis or groundwork for his resolution, the hon. gentleman was obliged to bring in, as an indication that England was not true to us, the tone of Earl Kimberley's despatches about the Fenian invasion and the withdrawal of the troops. He (Sir John) thought it was unfortunate his language on this subject should have been of the kind heard. It would be quoted and republished in every journal in the United States, and turned to our disadvantage. The hon. gentleman complained of the words of the despatch recommending the use of becoming language, on our part, in forwarding our claims from the Fenian raid, and that there was no expression of sympathy with us. We did not want any further expression of sympathy than we had received again and again. England asked our statement, for what purpose? To lay it before the Washington Government. We were merely asked to set it forth in diplomatic, courteous language, so as to avoid annoying the susceptibilities of either people, already delicate on account of the "Alabama" and other questions. As to the withdrawal of the troops, he was not concerned, on behalf of the Canadian Government, to support or defend the course taken by Her Majesty's Government in their own discretion. As an individual and a member of a Canadian Government, and looking to the future relations between Canada and England, to the growing importance of Canada, and of a warm, friendly feeling between her and England and between them and the States, he had no hesitation in saying it was a mistake to withdraw the troops. He thought it would have been a wiser policy—as a symbol of the sovereignty of England in this Continent—to use the words of Mr. Campbell—to have left the troops among us. That opinion was held by one of the oldest and most experienced of English statesmen, Earl Russell, the representative of the great Whig Party, and by Lord Carnarvon a leading statesman, and one of the chiefs of another great party. The Government, however, had taken a different ground, believing that the interests of England, as well as of the Empire, were better served by the concentration of the troops in the Mother Country. Though he believed this a mistaken policy, it was no evidence of England's intention to disregard her pledge, to defend us with the whole power of the Empire. The British Government, in compliance with the

Canadian Government's representations on this matter—they had not failed in their duty in respect to it (hear, hear—from Hon. Sir A. T. Galt)—reiterated their pledges of 1865, that the whole force of the Empire would be used in our defence (Cheers). Why then express distrust of England? The hon. gentleman said he was glad the Canadian Government had not suggested the Mixed Commission, and that he (Sir John A.) was in error in stating they had. In 1866, after the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, Minister Adams proposed, that while the whole subject of the renewal of the treaty or the settlement of the fishery question was under discussion, the American fishermen should be allowed their old unrestricted fishing privileges. Lord Clarendon's speech in reply was a master piece of statesmanship. He readily met the proposal for a Commission on the disputed question. We, however, at once represented that during the discussion of the matter, we should not agree that Canada should be precluded from asserting her right. That despatch was sent to Lord Clarendon, and by him transmitted to the United States Government, and from that moment the matter ended. It ceased to be a matter of personal interest, and became as much a matter of history as the proceedings in connection with the Treaty of Ghent. Lord Clarendon saw the astute mode in which the American Minister proposed to keep open the question of our fishery rights, while the Commission might sit till eternity.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—Mr. Campbell said it was accepted by Lord Clarendon.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did accept it on certain conditions, which were not accepted by the American Government, and so the thing fell to the ground. Why did we renew the proposition in any shape whatever? It was important we should have not only the moral support of Her Majesty's Government, but the material support of her fleet. England at once granted us this support, in the shape of a large squadron, commanded by an able and energetic officer. We assented to the proposal of England that we should not, for the time, assert our exclusive rights to the Fisheries, till the headland question was settled. We did not abandon or waive our rights, but merely, to remain in accord with the British Government, with whom rested the responsibility for peace or war with the States, we yielded to their wishes for the time being. He believed we were right in so doing, and should have shown a selfish disregard of the interests of England, had we taken any different course. We showed a due

regard for England's interests and our own in delaying till a more opportune season the enforcement of our rights. We felt and still feel the inconvenience of having the rights we were afraid to enforce—of having to waive from day to day and year to year—and therefore had instructed Mr. Campbell to ask for a mixed Commission to settle the fishery question. He believed in so doing they would receive the approbation of the House and country (cheers). They had thus gained the assistance of Her Majesty's Government on the fishing banks and at Washington. He believed the experience of last year had shown that, if we persisted in the policy we commenced in 1867—setting aside the question of headlands altogether—the policy of a rigorous exclusion of American fishermen from our three mile limit—we should virtually exclude all foreign fishermen from our waters. They would not, so great would be our geographical superiority, find it to their interest to employ their capital in our waters. We were thus gaining our rightful advantages, while abstaining, at the instance of England, from pressing our rights to their utmost limits. We adopted the license system because it was regarded as merely provisional, till a better, a final one could be devised. His hon. friend was wrong in thinking that a system of licenses was less difficult to enforce than one of exclusion. The exclusion altogether was much easier, because the other system required a large police, with constant visits and interference. His hon. friend was opposed to the license system.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said the hon. Premier was wrong in saying he was opposed to the license system.

Hon. Sir J. A. MACDONALD said his hon. friend's policy was the same as his own on the subject. As Ministers in the same Government, the moment the Treaty came to an end, they proposed the complete exclusion of American fishermen from Canadian waters. They were to be notified of this decision promptly. The Government, of which the member for Sherbrooke was a member, acted promptly and decisively on the subject. They adopted the licensing system as a temporary expedient and in deference to the wishes of the British Government. It was to be employed only until a new and better arrangement could be made. The Governments of the Maritime powers also consented to the English recommendation. The Canadian Government by its Order in Council, of 1866, announced that their fixed policy was one of exclusion. So in this way the hon. gentleman was opposed to the licenses.

Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—Of course, in the same way as my hon. friend (laughter.)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—The license system was found a failure, and it was perceived that the effective assertion of our Canadian rights was the only, the best course we could pursue. The last hope of the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty having ended, and the licenses having failed, they introduced again, in 1870, the policy of exclusion which had proved successful. It would appear by the papers, that the Canadian Government desired a Commission touching the headland question. The Imperial Government had a right to unite the Fishery and "Alabama" questions, and having this right, there was no reason to fear Canadian interests would be sacrificed in the negotiations. One would think from the speech of the hon. gentleman, that the settlement of the "Alabama" question was a matter of no importance. Was it of no importance that a terrible war between England and the States, which would subject Canada to all the miseries of the battle ground, should be avoided? (Cheers). If this threatening cloud were removed—if the pending controversies were settled—we might calculate upon a long term of peace with the United States, with increased trade and prosperity, upon a vista of tranquility, progress and happiness. He was glad the United States had suggested the settlement of this dispute, and when there was a mutually sincere desire on this subject, there would be a way found out of the difficulty (cheers). The invitation to Canada to take part in this Commission, showed that Canada had made an additional step in the estimation and favour of England, in this, that he, unworthy as he was, should have been chosen to represent the cause of Canada at Washington (cheers). His hon. friend had expressed himself as afraid that the Fisheries question would be neglected if associated with the "Alabama" claims and others, in which the Imperial Government were more directly interested. He (Sir John) thought differently. The very fact of its being made a matter of Imperial interest, and on which the Imperial statesmen were obliged to act with the same force as on the "Alabama" claims, would give it more importance in the eyes of the United States Government than if dealt with by a smaller committee. He had no doubt that if he were to take sweet counsel with his hon. friend on the resolutions, they would find that there was little difference between their views.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—(Hear, hear).

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—That was one thing, but it was quite another mat-

ter to bring the subject before the House at this time. It was much to be regretted that an attempt should be made to fetter the representation of the Dominion. How would he stand in Washington with the other unfettered representatives, if he was sent merely as a delegate, to repeat the instructions he had received from this Parliament. It would prevent a free and frank discussion of the question if he was to be restricted to saying, as these resolutions would imply, that the demands of Canada were merely for modifications of our commercial relations with the United States. Could anyone imagine the four Commissioners from England receiving instructions from the British Parliament in such a way? He was quite sure that the gentlemen who composed that Commission would decline to act under such conditions. He agreed with his hon. friend, that by international law, and the treaty of 1818, the three miles of water extending along our shores were as much a portion of Canada as any place three miles within land, and could his hon. friend suppose for a moment that England would give away a portion of our territory? There was no fear of England ceding a part of Canada, and she would as much be giving up a portion of this country, by ceding our rights to the three mile limit, as if she gave away one of our cities. Her policy was opposed to ceding territory in any case without the consent of the inhabitants of the place to be given up. Then again, Lord Granville, in the House of Lords, and Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, have announced that the action of the Commission would not be final. If the result of this Commission was to settle the pending questions, he had not the slightest doubt that all matters affecting this country would be submitted to this Parliament for ratification. It was so with the Reciprocity Treaty. In 1866 there was a Mixed Commission appointed to settle the fisheries question between France and England. That Commission quite re-arranged the matter. The treaty they framed was submitted to the British Parliament and ratified by them, but was rejected by the French Government, and the policy of the British Government was so averse to considering a treaty binding, that was not ratified by the people affected by it, that the treaty of that Commission is considered a nullity. In the Joint High Commission about to sit at Washington there would be a sincere desire on both sides, he believed, for a settlement of the pending disputes, but there was no risk whatever to our interests. Even if we could suppose that England were willing to sacrifice us, as a

matter of law she could not, until the Canadian Parliament ratified the treaty by its own act. He hoped his hon. friend would be satisfied by this discussion, that our rights were of the first importance, that they could not be over estimated, and that our interests must not be given away or surrendered in any way, except by our own act. He had no doubt that such was the general opinion of this House, and he hoped his hon. friend would not inopportunely affect the action of the Commission, by pressing his resolutions to a vote, but would consent to withdraw them (cheers).

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had listened with great pleasure to the speeches of the member for Sherbrooke and the leader of the Government, and was far from regretting that the discussion had taken place. The leader of the Government had taken very strong grounds on the subject, asking on what occasion England had ever failed Canada in her negotiations. Unfortunately, he maintained, she had almost always failed her, mentioning the treaty relating to the boundary between the United States and Canada, both in the east and west, as an instance in which the ignorance of English statesmen had resulted in depriving Canada of a large amount of territory which she ought to possess, and it was therefore no matter of surprise, that when a new question such as the one then under discussion came up, the people of Canada should manifest some doubt as to whether they would obtain a satisfactory settlement. Still the House had already pronounced on the subject in its reply to the speech of the Governor General, and as the matter of the Commission was already settled and the Commissioners appointed, he thought the passage of the resolutions would imply a suspicion, that the parties named in the Commission would not fairly consider the matters with which they had to deal. It should also be remembered, that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government was to be a member of that Commission, and although he had never agreed with that gentleman's views, he could not believe that any Canadian who had occupied the prominent position that that gentleman had occupied, could ever be so lost to the honour of his country as to fail to recognize his duty, and while he agreed with many of the views expressed by the member for Sherbrooke, he thought it would be wrong to force the adoption of the resolutions he had moved. He believed it was essentially necessary for Canada to use every means in her power to promote friendly relations

with the United States, and he, for one, was willing to make any reasonable concessions to accomplish that end, but it had in the past invariably been found, that anything yielded was merely the prelude of more exorbitant demands on the part of the States. The hon. gentleman, at the head of the Government, had mentioned in his speech, the subject of the national defence. In this matter he would simply say, that in his opinion the mere retention of a few British troops could be of no possible avail as a defence from an attack from the United States, and that if ever such an attack should be made, it would have to be met by a force ten or twenty times as large as that, which the British Government could ever be asked to station in Canada, and if the British troops were merely to act as a symbol of the force of the Empire that lay behind them, why we had that symbol in our own redcoats and in our flag, which was the same as that of England, and he did not think therefore it would make any difference whether the three or four thousand British troops were left in Canada or taken away altogether. As we had already the assurance of the British Government, that whilst we remained in connection with her, the whole force of the Empire would always be available for our defence. He believed, however, that the really valuable spirit of the United States was hostile to any acquirement of territory by conquest, and that spirit would steadily grow; and looking at the future, he did not believe the time would ever come, that Canada would have to defend her territory against an army from the United States. If ever there should be war between England and the United States, it would be for some cause that was considered just by one country or the other, and he had too much faith in the people of both countries, to believe, that the one would ever be guilty of committing any wrong, that would compel the other to go to war to repair. He thought that in the matter under discussion, they owed a certain obligation to the opinions of the gentlemen opposite, and as they had declared that it would be injurious to their success in negotiating with the other members of the Commission, to have any such resolutions passed as those then before the House, and as on other grounds he thought it would be impolitic to pass those resolutions, he felt bound to recommend their withdrawal. He wished, however, to refer to one expression made use of by the member for Sherbrooke, namely: that the Imperial Government would rather concede some of our rights in compensation for the "Alabama" claims than make a money payment.

Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT stated that what he had intended to say, and what he believed he had said, was, that the American Government would prefer to receive some such concession than a money payment.

Mr. MACKENZIE, after acknowledging the correction, proceeded to say that he believed the sole object of the leading men in the United States in keeping the subject of the "Alabama" claims so prominently forward was, to endeavour to drive British power entirely from the continent, and as far as that was concerned, he agreed with the remarks of the member for Sherbrooke, who, he was sure, would join heartily in resisting all such attempts. The future position of Canada might be such as was anticipated by the member for Sherbrooke, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) did not think it was desirable that any change should take place in our political relations, and he did not speak of this merely as a matter of sentimental attachment, although he was not ashamed to own that he had that sentimental attachment, but on material grounds, he believed it was for our interest that our relations should not be changed. But if the anticipations of the honourable gentleman should be realised, he believed the people of Canada would be fully equal to the emergency. He thought it was very desirable that the public men of Canada should express a bold, decided opinion on the matter under discussion, but he hoped the honourable gentleman, the mover of the resolutions, would not force a vote upon them, as he thought a division would be most undesirable.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he was sure the House would agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that no more important question had ever been submitted to that Parliament than the one now under consideration. He (Dr. T.) considered that the Government, the House, and the country were deeply indebted to the hon. mover of these resolutions, as the discussion that had been elicited would show to the world, that while public men here differed upon the comparatively insignificant question as to who should administer public affairs, the moment that any question arose involving the material interests or touching the honour of the Dominion, all parties would be found standing shoulder to shoulder in defence of the rights of their common country. (Cheers.) He accepted the statement frankly made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that he had moved these resolutions with a sincere desire to strengthen the hands of the Government, and of the first Minister as a

member of the Joint Commission, in its fullest sense, (hear, hear, from Sir A. T. Galt,) but he believed that the hon. member would, seeing that his object had been fully attained by the discussion, in deference to the desire expressed on both sides of the House, consent to withdraw them. He could not agree with that hon. member in the opinion that there was any ground for distrusting the Imperial Government. He had faith in the Government, Parliament, and people of England, and believed that no party could retain power in that country who would sacrifice the rights of the Dominion. In relation to the important question of the Fisheries, the House had the guarantee of the past that our interests would be duly protected. This was not a question of yesterday. For the last thirty years this controversy had existed, except, when, happily, suspended during the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty. The British Government having discovered that a great error had been committed in allowing the United States to fish in our waters, under the treaty of 1783, when that treaty was abrogated by the war of 1812, refused to renew those concessions, although earnestly pressed for by the United States. In defence of our rights they sent a naval force into British American waters, and made numerous seizures of American fishing vessels, until, by the convention of 1818, the United States renounced for ever the right of fishing within three miles of the coasts, bays or harbours of British America, except in certain localities therein specified. In 1819 an Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament, to carry into effect the provisions of that Convention. In 1836 the Legislature of Nova Scotia passed a stringent Act for the same purpose, containing a clause under which the master of a fishing vessel could be examined under oath if found hovering in our waters. In 1838 a naval force was sent from England in response to an address from the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and in the following year numerous seizures of trespassers took place. In 1841 an exhaustive remonstrance was made by Mr. Stevenson, the American Minister at the Court of St. James, complaining of the severity of the Nova Scotia Act, the exclusion of American fishing vessels from the bays, and from a line drawn three miles outside of the headlands, and claiming the right to navigate the Gut of Canso. This was referred to the Government of Nova Scotia, and a case on all these points was prepared and sent for the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England. The opinion of the Advocate and Attorney Generals of the British Gov-

ernment, sustaining our view of the question on all these points, was adopted and sent out by Lord Stanley, in 1842. In 1843 the "Washington," an American fishing vessel, was seized for fishing in the Bay of Fundy, and Mr. Everett, then the United States Minister, made an earnest appeal to Lord Aberdeen, claiming that that Bay ought to be excepted. He said, May 25, 1844; "the existing doubt as to the construction arises from the fact that a broad arm of the sea runs up to the Northwest between the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. This arm of the sea being commonly called the Bay of Fundy, though not in reality possessing all the characters usually implied by the term Bay, has of late years been claimed by the Provincial authorities of Nova Scotia to be included among the Coasts, Bays and Creeks, and has been forbidden to American Fishermen." Lord Aberdeen while asserting the right to exclude foreigners under the convention of 1818, from the Bay of Fundy, agreed to make it an exception from all the other Bays, but asked in return for this "liberal concession" a reduction in the American duty on fish, which was made by Congress in 1846. An attempt having been made to extend this privilege to other bays, the Colonial Minister, Lord Stanley, sent a despatch in reply to remonstrances from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, saying that Her Majesty's Government would adhere to the strict letter of the treaty except as to the Bay of Fundy. In 1851 the agreement of Colonial delegates in Toronto, to unite in the protection of the Fisheries, was followed by a proposal for reciprocal trade between the United States and British America in the Presidential message. Nothing having been done in 1852, Sir John Pakington sent a despatch saying, "among the many pressing subjects which have engaged the attention of Her Majesty's Ministers since their assumption of office, few have been more important in their estimation than the questions relating to the protection solicited for the Fisheries on the coast of British North America. Her Majesty's Ministers are desirous to remove all grounds of complaint on the part of the Colonies in consequence of the encroachments of the fishing vessels of the United States upon those waters, from which they are excluded by the terms of the convention of 1818, and they therefore intend to despatch, as soon as possible, a small naval force of steamers or other small vessels to enforce the observance of that Treaty." Those who have been surprised at the recent message of President Grant, will find by looking back to the events of that day, that history is

only repeating itself. The excitement in and out of Congress was far greater than now, but it was only the prelude to a fresh proposal for a convention on reciprocal trade made in December of the same year, and which resulted in a Reciprocity Treaty which happily disposed of all these difficulties, and which resulted in the greatest commercial advantages to both countries. Unfortunately, in a moment of irritation, arising from circumstances connected with the late Civil War, the Government of the United States put an end to that Treaty, and deprived their fishermen of the privileges they had under it enjoyed. The British Government believing that a new Treaty would be made if our rights were not at once enforced, proposed that they should be left in abeyance for one year with that object, but readily concurred in the policy of requiring foreign fishing vessels to pay license. They sustained the Government of Canada in raising that charge, and when it was found ineffective in enforcing our rights, and no disposition evinced for reciprocal trade, they again sent a large naval force to aid in excluding foreign fishermen. New causes of irritation having sprang up between England and America, Her Majesty's Government have desired, pending their discussion, to avoid the enforcement of our extreme rights; but they have been careful to notify the United States that they do not concede anything that has ever been claimed under the treaty of 1818. He (Dr. Tupper) contended that with this evidence before us of the determination on the part of England, not to yield up one jot or one tittle of our rights, but to aid us on every occasion for the past thirty years to maintain them unimpaired, it would be as unjust as it would be ungrateful to evince the slightest distrust, or to suppose for a moment that the Imperial Government could for any consideration forget the interests of this Dominion. His hon. friend, the member for Sherbrooke, had complained of the withdrawal of the troops from Canada, but while all would regret their departure, if Her Majesty's Government were of the opinion that by concentrating their forces in England they could best consult the security of the Empire, we must bow to their decision. The House must not forget that, no sooner had the first indication of danger occurred at the time of the "Trent" affair, than swift steamers from England were following each other in rapid succession across the ocean, pouring troops and munitions of war into Canada for its defence. Nor must it be forgotten that two regiments of British troops and three batteries of artillery are maintained at Halifax, the present headquarters, which is being made

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

one of the strongest fortresses in the world by Imperial expenditure. If Her Majesty's Government had shown an anxious desire to avoid any possible cause of collision with the United States, he believed it was largely increased by the reflection, that in such a struggle Canada must naturally be the battle ground for that unnatural war. He could readily understand the desire of England to avoid by any means consistent with national honour, a war that would be a disgrace to civilization. For his own part he had no fear on this point, and did not expect that the hon. gentleman would ever see a blow struck between the two countries, but all would rejoice to see every cause of difference removed, as he had no doubt they would be by the measures proposed by the Joint Commission about to sit at Washington. He rejoiced to know that no time could be more opportune than the present for the consideration of the questions in which Canada was so deeply interested. The abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty was done under the mistaken impression that Canada was so dependent upon the policy of the United States, that it would be compelled to join them. The Confederation of these Provinces was then considered an experiment likely to result in failure. Only a year ago the North West was in a state of insurrection, and it was said that British Columbia was seeking annexation to the Republic. To-day the Provinces of this Dominion are consolidated into one harmonious whole. The new Province of Manitoba, with the vast North West, has been added to our country without shedding one drop of blood, and the Legislature of British Columbia has unanimously asked admission into the Confederation upon the terms offered by the Government of Canada. Instead of being starved into annexation by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, we find our exports to the United States exceeded the former year, and were five millions in excess of our imports from that country. Never did the whole of the Dominion enjoy so high a degree of prosperity; while each of the Provinces of which it is composed can boast a large surplus revenue, the Central Government is able to show an increase of thirteen millions in our exports over the former year; a large increase in the Revenue from Imports, Excise Canals, Railways, Post Office and Bill Stamps, evidencing the highest degree of commercial prosperity, while the value of Canadian Bonds and Stocks has reached a point never before attained. Such is the financial position of Canada, that the Government is prepared not only to construct the Intercolonial Railway, and grapple

vigorously with the great questions of canals and a railway to the Pacific, but at the same time reduce the comparatively light taxation of the people. I feel assured that under these auspicious circumstances the hon. member for Sherbrooke will withdraw his resolutions, and this House by its unanimous action will show to the world, that all parties in Canada have unqualified faith in the justness of our cause, and the support of England in the maintenance of our rights, by allowing the Commissioner whom Her Gracious Majesty has chosen for Canada, to enter upon the high duties with which he is charged, as free and untrammelled as his colleagues belonging to either England or America (loud cheers).

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL was surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member opposite. The circumstances of this country with regard to England had undergone no change. With respect to our Fisheries, the policy of the English and Canadian Governments, has been the using of them, with a view to promote the reciprocal trade of Canada and the States. The chief object was not the simple protection of our Fisheries. So far as we had gone little had been gained in the direction desired. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches had changed their views with regard to the importance of the Fisheries as a means to the attainment of a larger trade with the States. The question would now seem likely to be settled on its merits. The questions to be submitted to the Commission were mainly connected with the late Civil War, with which we had nothing to do. The claims of Canada touching the Fenian invasion do not seem likely to be dealt with. The House should receive distinct assurances that the Government had done its duty in this matter. If all the other subjects mentioned in connection with the Commission were to be considered, the Raid claims would stand a poor chance of consideration. He was glad at the prospect of a settlement of these questions, but feared the High Commission without any expression on the part of this House, would dispose of the Fishery question to the advantage of England, and as a set off to the Alabama claims. The interests of Canada would run the risk of grave injury. The rights and interests of the people of this country should not be sacrificed as a set off to American claims upon England, and this House should so express its opinion. From personal knowledge of the feeling of men in the Lower Provinces, he could state, that it was feared the rights and claims of Canada would suffer in the forthcoming Commission. That was his own apprehension also. There was no doubt that vigilance

and determined action were necessary on the part of Canadian statesmen to prevent our interests being seriously compromised. We had suffered gravely from the blunders of British and Colonial representatives in dealing with questions between us and the United States. The tendency of the negotiations, the spirit in which they would be undertaken, led to the conclusion that our interests were in danger. (Ironical cheers). He was firmly convinced that the attempt of the Government of Canada to put in force extreme claims and rights of this country with regard to the Fisheries, without the cordial assistance of the Imperial Government, was a dangerous policy, (cheers and counter cheers). The Hon. Finance Minister laughed, but if England had gone to war with Russia, as was lately probable, another kind of expression would have overspread his countenance. He believed that the Hon. Premier should not be allowed to commit this country to any arrangement—that he should not be subjected to defeat in the Commission by a majority of his colleagues, without a previous declaration of the opinion of this House, (cheers).

Mr. YOUNG said as far as the resolutions were concerned, he could not agree with the hon. member for Sherbrooke; at the same time he did not think it right to find fault, unless the question was brought before them in an enlarged manner. Our relations both to the United States and the Mother Country should be cordial and friendly. The interests of the Dominion tended to draw closer the bonds of friendship with the Mother Country and the United States. We all sprang from the same origin, and we ought to be drawn together in the common bonds of friendship and good feeling, and if others did anything that would cause a breach of amity and good feeling, we would not be to blame. With the exception of one particular point he did not think that any just cause of complaint could be brought against Canada. He referred to placing the duty on coal. He warned the Minister of Finance that matter would be taken exception to, on the other side of the line, and that it would be likely to create ill feeling there. With the exception of that one serious blunder the policy of the Government had been conciliatory. But disguise it as we might, a very considerable portion of their people had encouraged attacks upon this country. With these facts before them, he, for one, felt that the Commission at Washington should stand up for the rights of this country. It would cause a dangerous feeling here, if the rights of our Fisheries were to be at all yielded to

the United States. With regard to the President's message, he considered that our policy had been most liberal towards them. It had gone to the extreme limits—as far as the rights of this Government could go. We have allowed them the use of our canals, and, considering the expense we had been at in the building of them, he thought, under these circumstances, we ought to stand up for our rights. He was inclined to think that from what was said about the Fenian raids, our Government had not pressed it upon the Imperial Government in as strong a light as they should have done. With regard to the Hon. Minister of Justice, he had the utmost confidence in his judgment and knowledge. We have learned some wholesome lessons since 1866, the time when the treaty was abolished. He could not speak much for the other Provinces, but for the Province of Ontario they had good evidence of the prosperity existing there. They had evidence that the deposits in the Banks were largely increasing. In 1869 there were six millions of dollars in the various Savings Banks, and at the present time there were fully seventy millions belonging to the people in our Building Societies. Still we were willing to meet our neighbours half way, though under no necessity of doing so. He considered if the Americans were prepared to place our commercial relations on a better basis, it would be for the advantage of both countries.

Mr. BLAKE thought that they were not in a position, from the information in their hands, to properly discuss the question; and even if they were, they were not, in the interest of the country, free to discuss it in all its bearings to any advantage; and while there could not be free, unfettered discussion, it was better there should be none at all. As to the best mode of settling international disputes, there was, of late days, no difference of opinion. The humane and equitable spirit was conceded all due influence. This did not conclude the present question, however. This was not the case of a regular dispute between two ordinary nations. The complicated position of the Mother Country, with its various dependencies and various interests, created or occasioned questions of a different character from those originating with other powers. He felt averse from pronouncing upon the present motion or the character of the Commission for a variety of reasons. In the first place, they did not know what its scope was. The Premier was not able to tell us whether it embraced the claims of Canada on account of the Fenian Raid. Then some of the members had not had time to study the

Hon. Mr. McDougall.

papers brought down, and some material to the case had evidently not been produced. A document made and sent to the United States was surely one which the people of Canada, in whose name and for whose behoof it was despatched, should have been made acquainted with (cheers). Again, we did not know whether our consent to the Commission's conclusions was to be asked. The Premier seemed to assume, that because the provisions of the treaty would "probably," as he had observed, be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, they would have to be submitted to this Parliament. That by no means followed, we had already recorded our views upon those matters shortly to be considered— that the people of this country had not demanded and did not demand anything more than their rights secured by treaty and the law of nations. Had we not recorded that declaration, the statement of the First Minister, on introducing this question, would have filled him (Mr. Blake) with considerable apprehension; because he believed this speech was designed to lead the country to the conclusion, that the head-land question was one which they would probably hear the end of in this Commission, and in a way not satisfactory to the people of this country (hear, hear). The question was, now, having recorded our position—what more could we do? The Commission had been constituted, the place had been decided. The Government took the responsibility in the first instance of proposing the Commission with regard to the Fisheries, and, in the second place, of agreeing to participate in the labours of that Commission, when its scope had been enlarged to other subjects, and, in the third place of agreeing to that Commission without knowing whether it would embrace the Fenian Raid claims of Canada. The step had been taken and was irrevocable. The Commission was just about to sit, and it appeared to him that no action they might take, could in the slightest degree reverse that policy at this moment. We were powerless to prevent the sitting of the Commission, or the continuance of its sittings, or its arrival at conclusions on the questions which the Premier said might probably be submitted to it. The question was, whether we ought to do or say anything which might in the slightest degree embarrass or impede the course of the Administration with regard to the matters upon which they had assumed this responsibility. His opinion was they should not by voice, vote, or record, do or say anything of the kind. We should allow matters to proceed without doing anything to hamper the Government, or tending to bring the

labours of the Commission to an unsuccessful termination. He did not think it was expedient we should come to any resolution whatever on this question. He believed, notwithstanding, the claims of Canada were indisputably correct. However, he joined with the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in requesting the hon. member for Sherbrooke to withdraw his resolutions.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT, in reply, said he was willing that the first minister and other gentlemen should combat his conclusions, but he denied their right to charge him with imputing motives when only interpreting acts. (cheers). With regard to the policy of Great Britain in the matter of the removal of the troops, he did not propose to discuss the question, as the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, had stated, as his individual opinion, that he was opposed to the present policy of the Imperial authorities, and it might be assumed that that was the opinion of the whole Government, as shewn by Mr. Campbell's report. He considered, however, that that policy evidenced a material alteration in the relation of the Empire to Canada, and he contended that it was therefore a fit subject for discussion, as it concerned the nearest interests of the country. The leader of the Government had also stated, in regard to the course taken by Canada on the Fishery question, that if Canada had refused to meet the wishes of the Imperial Government in the matter of Licenses, she would have been acting against the interests of the Empire, and would have been liable to all the consequences that might have flowed from a serious disagreement between England and the United States. He thought, however, that that argument should have been remembered by the Government a year ago, when they determined on the policy then commenced, which was certain to bring about this disagreement. What he had desired throughout had been, that such a temperate policy should be pursued as would have avoided all trouble. Still, in the present aspect of the matter, although he might disagree with the course the Government had taken, he would not be found weakening their hands. The member for Lambton, though admitting that the debate might prove useful, had stated he thought it would appear ungracious to interfere in any way with the proceedings of the Commission, and had spoken of his (Sir A. T. Galt's) remarks on the question of defence, as though they had some practical bearing on the particular question under discussion, whereas they had only been intended to indicate in the policy of the Imperial

Government a divergence from that of the Canadian Government, showing the necessity that the House should express its opinion on a question which concerned Canada alone. He then referred to the enquiries which had been made in the House of Commons in England, in reference to the scope and powers of the Commission, as a sufficient precedent to justify him in bringing the question before the House. The member for West Durham had stated that the discussion was inopportune, inasmuch as the House had already disposed of the matter in its reply to the speech of His Excellency. He maintained that in passing that reply it was understood that the House was not bound to anything; and he would mention that, on that occasion, he had only been prevented from introducing the present discussion by expressions from both sides of the House, that it had better be postponed to a future time.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that he had, on the occasion of the passing of the reply to the Address, asked for the papers, expressly in order that the discussion might take place.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT continued, that the discussion was only postponed in the absence of the papers, and he had therefore simply brought forward what ought to have been disposed of in considering the address. However, on a question of such importance, surrounded by considerations of the very gravest moment, he would be unworthy of his position as a representative of the people if he did not defer to what appeared to be the general opinion of the leading members of the House. He had thought that a declaration of the views of the House on the question would do good, and he still thought so, but inasmuch as the first Minister of the Crown had stated that he would feel hampered and embarrassed in the discharge of the important duties assigned to him, if the resolutions before the House were carried, he had only one course open for him. The leader of the Government had thus assumed the responsibility of the matter, and he had the most implicit confidence that the honourable gentleman, whatever he might think of his policy in some respects, would do his duty in the interests of the country, ably and well, and he felt that they had obtained some additional guarantee for their safety in the negotiations then about to take place. He therefore asked permission to withdraw his resolutions.

Mr. FORTIN said that in rising to address some remarks on the important subject under discussion, he would first beg the indulgence of the House as he

was going to speak in a language that was not his own. He had heard the hon. member for the North Riding of Lanark make a statement that he could not admit. This hon. member had said, that in the protection of our Fisheries, we had advocated and maintained extreme rights. Mr. Fortin was ready to assert, (and in this assertion he was sure to be sustained by all the people engaged in the Fisheries,) that the Government of Canada had not maintained extreme rights in the execution of the measures adopted by the protection of the Fisheries. Far from it. We had always acted in a friendly and conciliatory spirit towards the fishermen of the United States, and we had even allowed several of our rights to remain in abeyance with a view to conciliation; such for instance as the right to draw the line inside which foreign fishermen are excluded, from headland to headland. We had only prevented the foreign fishermen to come and fish inside the three miles limit, in waters, which according to the law of nations, are uncontestedly ours. We have advocated the same rights that the Government of the United States maintain on their own sea board. It is also said that when the treaty of reciprocity was cancelled, our Government did not give sufficient notice to the people of the United States of our intention to maintain our rights, and thereby exclude foreign fishermen from our waters. Why, when we, in 1866, we adopted the license system, by which we allowed the fishermen of the United States to participate in our inshore fisheries for a nominal fee, it was well understood at the time that we would stand by our rights the next year. However, we continued the system through the same spirit of conciliation and friendliness, in 1867, 1868, and 1869, although it had proved a failure, very few American vessels having taken licenses during the last two years. Did we receive any compensation for what I will call the surrender of our rights, from the people of the United States? I must answer, No. Could we continue this system any longer? No, it was against the interests of our fishermen to do so, and we stood by our rights. The Government of the United States was informed of this determination of ours. The United States Government gave notification of it to their own fishermen as early as the middle of the month of May, and besides, despatched one of their war vessels in the Gulf to warn their fishermen against intruding in our waters. Was not that sufficient notice? But besides, are not the American fishermen instructed as to our rights on the back of their fishing licenses, that

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt.

they have to take instead of clearances from their Custom Officers when they start for a fishing voyage? There is to be found on that document the greatest part of the treaty of 1818, by which they can see at once on what parts of the British coasts they have a right to fish, and on what other parts they have not that right. In my opinion this complaint, that our Government did not sufficiently notify the fishermen of the United States of our intention to maintain our fishery rights, is futile and not at all founded on facts. Another complaint that has come from across the border, is that we, in an unfriendly manner, have prevented the fishing vessels from getting their fishing supplies and transhipping their cargoes in our ports. This is nothing else but exercising a right of trading, and it is well known that by the treaty of 1818, no such right is granted to the fishermen of the United States. I will say more, the American fishing vessels are forbidden by their own Government to trade in foreign ports. With regard to the fishery question itself, he thought that the matters in contestation between the two Governments were not difficult of adjustment. Our fishery rights were undeniable, and could be easily established beyond any doubt. As for the three miles limit, we only asserted and claimed rights that were given to all maritime nations on their seaboard by the law of nations, and which the United States people claim and maintain themselves on their own seaboard. The right of drawing the line from headland to headland was not, on our part, a new pretension. The British Government had always maintained that right, and had repeatedly asserted it by the seizure of American vessels found fishing inside of that line, prior to the coming into operation of the Reciprocity Treaty. And when this treaty was cancelled, this right was only left in abeyance, in a spirit of friendliness and conciliation towards the people of the United States, but it was never given up by our Government. And why should we abandon it? Does not the Government of the United States claim and maintain a similar right on the coasts? Do not they assert and exercise jurisdiction over the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay, although both are about twelve miles in breadth at their mouths? and should we be refused a similar right on our seaboard? The question of the Fisheries was going to be submitted to a Commission composed of British and American statesmen, and he was happy to know that we would be represented in that Commission by our able Premier. He had confidence that the British Commissioners

would defend our rights, and the Mother Country would stand by us. And if for the purpose of ensuring the continuance of amicable and peaceful relations, and giving greater facilities to the trade between the two countries, some arrangements were recommended by the Commission, he expected that none of our rights would be given up, unless equivalent advantages were secured. Our inshore waters are the fields of operation of our maritime population. It is there that our fishermen have to reap for the support of their families. It is, so to say, the soil they have to till day and night, and every one knows how their work is laborious, dangerous, and often poorly recompensed. And therefore, if any of our Fishery rights are to be given up, a policy that I am not prepared to recommend, it must be well understood that equivalent advantages, directly benefitting our maritime population, must be secured from our neighbours, such as fishing rights on the United States coasts, although I may say they are not of great value to us; a free market for our fish, and the same advantages to our shipping in the waters of the United States, as they enjoy in ours. Mr. Fortin had also a few remarks to make with regard to another complaint coming from the other side of the line. It was that the fishermen of the United States had been molested on our coasts. He could say that this was also without foundation. It had been his lot to be employed during sixteen years in the protection of the Fisheries of Canada, and he had reliable information as to what had taken place in the Gulf prior to the establishment of the Protection Service in 1852, and he could say that the American fishermen had never been molested on our shores, neither by the agents of the Government, nor by our maritime population, who at all times treated the American fishermen in a most friendly manner. He would say more, it was the Americans that had often molested our fishermen in our waters, and he could prove that this was the case by citing numerous instances. But he would content himself by mentioning the following cases: How often has it not happened that our fishermen have been practically excluded from the harbor of Natashquan, and the fishing grounds adjoining it, although Natashquan is to the West of Mount Joli, and consequently undeniably in waters reserved to the British fishermen, because American fishing vessels happening to be there before our vessels, filled that harbour to such an extent, that hardly any room was left for our own vessels to find shelter in it, while the fishing grounds were covered by swarms of American fishing boats,

which, as may be well understood, injured very materially the operations of our fishermen. How many times have not large numbers of American fishing vessels come to anchor in our harbours, roadsteads and bays, inside and among the moorings of the nets of our fishermen, and have either prevented the latter from setting their nets, which were going to provide them with bait for the next day's work, or have, in running out during the night or even in day time, torn and destroyed many of those nets, worth from \$20 to \$40, by catching them with the keels of their vessels, and thereby depriving our fishermen of the means of prosecuting their labours of the morrow and sometimes of many days. No bait, no fishing, as every one knows. I will not speak of the numerous instances in which our maritime population have suffered from depredations, trespasses and other acts of malfeasance, and for which our people got no redress. Before ending his remarks, Mr. Fortin renewed the expression of his confidence in the Government and said that the utterances that had fallen from the lips of the Honourable Premier, when he spoke this afternoon, confirmed him in the belief that in the negotiations about to be opened at Washington, the Government would maintain our rights. He added, that the protection given to our fisheries last year had been productive of a great deal of good, and hoped that it would be continued. There was a time when this question of our fisheries and their development and protection were looked at under different points of views by the people of the different sections of this country. The western portion of this country had in general always opposed the fostering and protection of this important part of our national wealth, and all know the opposition that had been made, and the ridicule that had been attempted, on the action of the Government, when the first expedition was fitted out in Canada, for the protection of our fisheries. But it was with pleasure that he could state now, that those unfortunate differences of opinion had disappeared, and that in the question now before the House, the sentiments of the whole nation were in unison. And this is not the least of the happy results of Confederation, which has bound together the people of the different Provinces not only by a material tie, but more so by sentiments of friendship, respect, and union, which justify us in the expectation of a bright future for this country.

Dr. ROBITAILLE—I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to offer any remarks on the subject that has occupied the attention of

Mr. Fortin.

this hon. House for several hours, but I must corroborate the statements made by my friend from Gaspé. The American fishermen have never been molested by our fishermen nor by the authorities of this country; on the contrary, they have been the aggressors on all occasions. They have, without provocation, ill-used our people on shore as well as at sea; they have taken advantage of the Sunday to abuse and insult our peaceful population on the highway as well as in the houses; they have wantonly destroyed nets set along the shore for bait, belonging to our fishermen; they have stolen our fishermen's boats, and have, by their large numbers, made themselves masters on the waters of Bay Chaleurs, as well as on shore, insulting and assaulting right and left without any provocation; and of this I am an eye witness. They used to look upon the *License System* as null and ridiculous, because, as they jocosely used to say, the officers engaged in protecting the Canadian fisheries must give them three warnings before seizing upon them, and they were sure of being *en route* for Boston after the first or second warning, with a full cargo; and therefore they would not take licenses when they could so easily avoid doing so. Hence the failure of the license system. I need not repeat what has been so eloquently said of the importance of our fisheries, of their value to our brave and hard-working fishermen, of their value to this country in a pecuniary point of view, as well as a field for the production of a hardy class of sailors, upon whom may depend on some future occasion the safety of this country. I need not enlarge upon the necessity of preserving intact those most valuable fishing grounds, that vast field of labour for nearly one-fifth of our population, as these things are fully understood by this House and by the public at large. My chief object in rising, when the subject of this debate has been so completely exhausted by able and eloquent speakers, is to ascertain from the honourable the leader of the Government if I understood him correctly, when I gathered from his remarks concerning the fisheries the other day, speaking on the Address, "*That the headland question was of little moment, provided we could preserve our exclusive right to the three miles limit.*" If I am correct in this, the Honourable Premier will permit me to say that he has not grappled with the importance of the question; that if he is prepared to give up the question of the headland limit, he may as well be prepared to give up the three miles reserve; that if he by any possibility entertains any such notions, he had better not go to Washington, as he would

sacrifice one of the greatest interests of the Dominion; and I speak thus to the honourable gentleman, because the moment he allows the American fishermen to penetrate into our bays, he may rest assured the fishing is done for our own people. For instance, the moment the American fishermen come into Bay Chaleurs, where I have personal experience, even keeping outside of the three miles limit, the fishing is done for our people, as they come in large numbers and ruin our fishing grounds, by their practice of sowing bait and throwing the offals of fish into the sea. The Hon. Premier knows that I appreciate his talents and his consummate knowledge (and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I had not had ten years experience of his ability, his statesman-like speech this afternoon would have been sufficient to gain my esteem). He knows that I repose implicit confidence in him; that I feel his presence at Washington will be a safeguard to the interests of the Dominion, and therefore I trust that he will accept my remarks in the same spirit as they are given, and that he will be in a position to dispel my apprehensions.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD had much pleasure in repeating what he had already said, which was, not that the headland question was of no consequence, but that it was unimportant as compared with the whole question of the Fisheries. In order to meet the wishes of Her Majesty's Government, and in order to obtain the support of that Government the Canadian Government had agreed that the headland question should be left in abeyance, but at the same time it was fully stated, and, in no way abandoned. If the Canadian Government had not so acted, it might have failed to get the moral support of the Imperial Government and the presence of the British squadron in Canadian waters.

Dr. ROBITAILLE—I am happy to hear the Hon. Premier say that the question of headlands will not be abandoned, and I have full confidence in his assertion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had expressed, last session, complaints because our fishermen were left unprotected against the encroachments and molestations of American Fishermen, and I feel it my duty to declare to this House, that during the last season, such judicious and efficacious protection has been given as commands my approbation as well as that of this honourable House.

Permission was then given for the withdrawal of the resolutions.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, Feb. 27, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

After routine business.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST made the motion, which he had allowed to stand over on a previous day, for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before the House copies of the correspondence relating to the Fisheries since the last return made to Parliament; also copies of all correspondence relating to the Joint Commission appointed by the Government of Great Britain and the United States. Great anxiety, he said, existed throughout the country with respect to the question, and grave doubts were entertained whether our rights would be preserved intact by the Commissioners meeting at Washington. Under these circumstances it was very desirable that the House should have every information given it respecting the question.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that he and his colleagues were much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he had allowed his motion to stand over until the papers were ready to be submitted elsewhere. That hon. gentleman had stated that some anxiety was entertained throughout the country with respect to the question, and grave doubts had arisen in some quarters whether the rights and privileges hitherto enjoyed by the people of the Dominion would be sustained or abandoned. He (Mr. Mitchell) was, however, glad to be able to tell his hon. friend, that there need be no such doubts henceforth, and that our rights would be fully vindicated. He was pleased to state his own firm conviction, and that of the Government of which he had the honor to be a member, that England would continue in the future as in the past to preserve the rights of the Dominion. In order that the House might thoroughly understand the question, it would be necessary to give a short history of it. Hon. gentlemen would remember the Treaty of 1783, under which certain privileges were given to the Americans. It was true that the Americans of that day claimed in the settlement of the Treaty of 1783, that they had as much right to certain fishing privileges as the British themselves. They claimed that they had assisted in conquering from old France a portion of the Provinces of British North America, to which the fisheries were a territorial adjunct.

Therefore, by right of conquest, they urged that they were entitled to an equal share in the fisheries. It must be evident to every one that such a claim could not be recognized by England. In fact, it was never acknowledged by her; but in that spirit of conciliation which so often characterizes her dealings with other powers, she determined rather than protract the war to grant certain concurrent privileges which they continued to enjoy up to 1812. When the war of 1812 broke out, of course that treaty of 1783 became a dead letter. When peace again ensued, difficulties arose in arranging a satisfactory plan with respect to the use of the fisheries. The treaty of 1814 was subsequently signed without any reference to the fisheries or the navigation of the Mississippi—the two questions on which there was a difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory arrangement. The Americans no doubt hoped by a persistent use of the privileges they enjoyed up to 1812, to obtain a right by *user* to the fisheries. It would be in the recollection of the hon. gentlemen who have studied the question that the British Government, under the direction of Earl Bathurst, issued a despatch giving such directions to the officer in command of the British North American squadron as would require him to enforce the strict rights which British subjects were entitled to enjoy, and excluding foreigners from participation in our fisheries, which were the exclusive property of the British. That law was strictly enforced for some time; with moderation, it was true, but nevertheless with firmness, so as to prevent any right of *user* accruing with respect to the fisheries. It would also be recollected that seizures were made which became the subject of remonstrance through the American Ambassador at the Court of London, and the result was the Convention of 1818, which ended in the American Government accepting the privilege of fishing, free “in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland, which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands, on the Western and Northern coast of Newfoundland from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Island, and also on the coasts, bays, harbours, and creeks from Mount Jolly, on the Southern coast of Labrador, and through the Straits of Belleisle, and thence Northeasterly indefinitely along the coast.” The Americans at the same time voluntarily abrogated any claims or privileges, if ever they had any, along the coast of the rest of the British North American possessions. The language of the treaty was so strong that it was worth while quoting it: “And

the United States hereby renounce, for ever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry, or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, not included within the above mentioned limits.” From 1818, during a few years, the rights of the two nations were perfectly well understood—no complaints of infringement were made. Subsequently, however, the Americans found that they were not enjoying as many advantages from the fisheries as they had formerly had, and then commenced to encroach upon the British American Fisheries. The effect of these encroachments was to direct to them the attention of the British Government who gave instructions to Admiral Seymour to enforce the law, and several seizures were accordingly made up to 1840. The right of excluding American fishermen was not only enforced by England within the three marine miles, but within the headlands. Then the question of headlands came up. It was urged on the one side that the question of headlands should not be enforced, inasmuch as one of headlands of the Bay of Fundy was on American territory. But the main argument was the terms of the treaty did not contemplate exclusion from the large bays, but from the small ones, such as were inside the Bay of Fundy itself. Neither the Bay of Fundy nor the Bay of Chaleurs, it was urged, was meant by the treaty. Thus the matter stood in 1840. The Americans continued to maintain, that they could not be legally excluded from the Bay of Fundy inasmuch as one of its headlands, was American territory. The English Government, whilst consenting to the practical use of the Bay, did not agree in the construction of the point raised by the Americans with respect to the headlands. At the same time, another question arose on account of the seizure of a vessel, about twenty miles off the coast of Nova Scotia. The subject being brought to the notice of the British Government they at once ordered that the vessel be given up on the ground that she was seized entirely out of their jurisdiction, and that the officer who had made the seizure had exceeded his instructions. But another seizure occurred afterwards within ten miles from the land, and the Government upheld that seizure, because it was made within the headland line claimed by the law of nations. It was admitted beyond a doubt both by American as well as English jurists and publicists that the Government of a country, having waters around it, has a territorial right to those waters to a distance of three miles along

the sinuosities of the shores. The Americans did not object to that, but the English Government went further and said that they had a right to exclude foreigners—not following merely the sinuosities of the shores, but three miles drawn from headland to headland. Similar claims were recognized by eminent American authorities like Story and Webster—all of whom were ever ready to assert American rights to the utmost. In 1840 a good deal of apprehension was felt concerning the question, but during the next four or five years the Nova Scotia Government acted with a great deal of vigor. They enforced the law not only in relation to the three marine miles, but with the aid of H. M.'s Fleet the headland policy, and made many seizures which were condemned in due form in the Courts. The Americans remonstrated, but the result was to sustain Nova Scotia in the assertion of the strict construction of the rights of the Provinces. In 1854 the Reciprocity Treaty was entered into, and there could be no doubt that the necessity of obtaining the use of the fisheries had a great deal to do with inducing the Americans to enter into that treaty. Under that treaty it was agreed that Americans should come within the headlands and inshore, in return for certain concessions granted us. That treaty remained in force for eleven years, and all recollected the manner in which it was repealed by the Americans taking the initiative. When the Government of Canada found that the Americans were resolved on the repeal of the treaty, there was a belief pervading the British portion of the continent that the privileges enjoyed under the treaty of 1818 would again come into effective operation. He need only say that at that time the British Government was anxious that no difficulties should arise on account of the enforcement of our rights, and adopted every mode to bring about an amicable arrangement. Mr. Cardwell brought the subject under the notice of the Government of the old Province of Canada, and they in a Minute of Council, under date of March 23, 1866, expressed the fear that the hope entertained by the British Government, that satisfactory commercial relations would be soon restored with the United States, would prove futile, and at the same time stated their belief that the prospects of attaining such a result in the future would be greatly diminished if the American Fishermen continued to exercise the rights of which the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty had deprived them. They suggested the issue to Americans of licenses to fish in Provincial waters at a moderate fee. That arrangement was carried out for a year, at the end of which a feeling still

prevailed that there was a chance of obtaining a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty. A conference was held at Washington on the subject, Hon. Messrs. Galt and Howland representing Canada, Hon. Mr. Henry, Nova Scotia; and Hon. Mr. Smith, New Brunswick. But time passed away, and there appeared little prospect of obtaining a new treaty. After Confederation the Government of Canada felt that it was necessary to enforce in some way the Fishery rights, and it was deemed advisable to continue the license fee which was raised to one dollar. The result of the working of the license system, however, was just as it had been predicted by Nova Scotia in 1866—That it would practically hand over the Fisheries to the Americans without compensation. The license fee was systematically evaded in the course of time, until the amount collected in 1869 was merely nominal. Under these circumstances the Government felt that it was incumbent upon them to refuse to grant further licenses, and to exclude foreigners from our fishing ground altogether. As respects the inshore Fisheries, the exclusion during the past season had been effective—the fleet of American Fishermen had been able to obtain only partial fares. As regards the Fisheries within the headlands, he would say that in 1865 the British Government urged the Canadian authorities not to ask the enforcement of the headland line. England was most anxious then as now to enforce our rights, but she wished to do so moderately but at the same time firmly. However, when the Americans continued to refuse to enter into new commercial arrangements, the British Government had to meet the question of the Fisheries during the past year. The Government of Canada, at the close of the past session, asked H. M. Govt. to assent to regulations for the enforcement of our right of excluding Americans from the inshore fisheries. They further asked that H. M. Govt. should enforce the British construction of the Treaty as maintained and enforced up to 1844, and failing that, should assent to a proposition to settle the dispute with respect to the headlands by reference to a joint Commission as proposed by Mr. Adams in 1866. The British Government consented to the latter proposition. His honorable colleague, the Postmaster General was sent to England, and the correspondence connected with his mission was before the House. The Canadian Government suggested that the plan recommended by Mr. Adams in 1866, and adopted by Lord Clarendon, for a Joint Commission to consider the questions in dispute respecting the Fisheries, might very properly be carried into effect. Her Majesty's Govern-

ment stated through Earl Kimberly, that they would make a proposition to that effect to the American Government, and subsequently we were informed that the United States while agreeing thereto wished to extend the scope of the Commission, and that was agreed to by the British Government. It was certainly a matter for satisfaction to Canada that not only her proposition for a Commission had been accepted, but that the place of meeting was arranged, as she had wished it, in America. That morning Sir John A. Macdonald had left for Washington to take his place on the Commission, as one of the representatives of British and Canadian interests. He (Mr. M.) had no sympathy whatever with those who were continually intimating that our interests would be sacrificed by England, in view of other and more potent considerations. The past history of England was a guarantee that none of our rights would be abandoned. The course she had pursued since the whole question had come before her, was sufficient to prove to us how anxious she is to subserve our welfare. Not only did she accept our proposition respecting the Commission, but she placed on it the foremost public man in Canada. In this way, she gave Canada a position which no other colony ever before occupied. In the first time in the history of England, she had given a Canadian and Colonial Statesman a share in the settlement of Imperial questions. Not only would a Canadian statesman be present to watch over our interests, but Lord Granville had stated in the House of Lords that the Commission could not take any final action—that the refusal of any one member to concur would put an end to it. No one could assert that a public man of the high standing of the Premier of Canada would sacrifice our rights, or give them up without some adequate compensation. If the United States showed any disposition to enter into a fair commercial arrangement, he was satisfied that Canada would be willing to meet them half way. As respects the question of the headlands, it was more a matter of law than of arrangement. As to the international law sanctioning our claims there could be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent man. In conclusion, he must refer to the interest now taken in the Fisheries by the people of Ontario as well as by those of Quebec. A short while since there was little knowledge in the West of the great resources of the Maritime Provinces, but now, as a representative of that section, he was gratified to see how identified Western men had become with the welfare and prosperity of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It was also

due to the commanders of the Canadian Marine Force—especially Captain Scott and Captain Lavoie, who respectively directed the operations of the two divisions of our cruisers—that he should speak of the energy and discretion with which they had performed the delicate and responsible duties entrusted to them in the course of the past season. It had already been intimated in another place that the same means of protecting our interests would be pursued as had been so successful last season.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that as a representative of one of the Maritime Provinces, with a coast line of 1,000 miles, he could not allow the present opportunity to pass without making a few remarks. He was glad to receive so strong an assurance from the Minister of Marine, that our rights in these inestimable treasures of the sea would be kept inviolate and intact. On one point, however, he wished information, and that was, the necessity for submitting the question at all to a Commission. He did not speak with a view of finding fault with the course pursued in the matter; it was perhaps the best plan to submit the question to a Commission. He had understood the hon. gentleman to say that the question was one of International law, and if that were so, why must it be disposed of in the way proposed. Previous to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, there were repeated seizures of vessels for the infraction of our rights. The result was the Reciprocity Treaty! That measure was, however, repealed, and we resumed our rights with respect to the Fisheries, and were apparently in the right track to make the Americans agree to other commercial arrangements. The Hon. Minister of Marine had spoken of the seizures between 1840 and 1845, only in a very cursory manner. Now, from 1846, during the eight years up to 1854, there were repeated seizures and forfeitures in the Vice-Admiralty Court of Nova Scotia; and the issue was the Americans were forced into the Reciprocity Treaty. It was certainly strange, he must add before concluding, to find the President of the United States in his annual message to congress, making such extraordinary statements on this very subject. Those remarks might have been made with the knowledge that the Commission was to meet; but at all events they were unwarrantable in fact. He was gratified that Canada was to be so ably represented on the Commission, and shared the anticipations of the Minister of Marine that her interests were safe in the hands of the Premier. It was only right to call attention to the fact that the expectations of his own Province with respect to the opera-

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

tion of the license system had been realized, but the remonstrances of the Government of Nova Scotia were unheeded. He hoped that now the question had assumed the present shape, some satisfactory solution would be found. It was with much satisfaction he saw that the Canadian Government had thought it their duty to insist upon the just claims they had, arising out of the recent Fenian invasions. He trusted that those demands would be followed up in the manner suggested in Earl Kimberley's cool despatch, and that they would be submitted in such a way as to obtain that justice which Canada has a right to ask (hear).

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD followed, and said that there had never been any doubt in New Brunswick as to the rights which we have respecting the headlands. It would be a matter of deep regret if the construction of the Treaty of 1818 was not enforced by the High Commission which has been appointed to adjust such matters. His object, however, in rising was to refer to the following passage in a joint address passed unanimously by the Legislature of New Brunswick in 1854, and especially setting forth our rights:—"Maritime nations at all times, and in every quarter of the globe, have set up and maintained certain exclusive privileges within three marine miles of the shore; and by universal custom and the law of nations, the claim has been defined by lines, not within bays, but from the entrance of such bays, as designated by a line drawn from headland to headland forming such bays; which law has been fully recognised by the most eminent statesmen, as well as other jurists; and by the articles of the Convention of 1818, the United States renounced forever the liberty of fishing within three marine miles of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of certain portions of the British North American colonies. This treaty stipulation is clearly expressed, and is incapable of misconstruction." Without dwelling further on that point, he would content himself with bearing testimony to the very efficient manner in which the Government had maintained our fishery rights, and to the interest now taken by the people of the West in the resources of the Maritime Provinces. He considered the latter fact a favorable omen for the future of the Confederation. (Hear.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST was not prepared to admit as much as the gentlemen who had just spoken. He could readily understand that the Government might, with a regard to the interests of the country, have suggested a Commission of three—one from Eng-

land, one from the United States and the other from Canada. It was quite possible that the United States would not have accepted the proposition; nevertheless it would have been one decidedly in the interests of Canada, for she would have the controlling power. The present Commission, however, was composed equally of British and American representatives, and was to deal with questions which England had a very great desire to settle as soon as possible. The vindication of the Fishery rights of Canada was only a trifling matter compared with the removal of other matters in dispute which might embroil England in war with the United States. He was not at all satisfied with the tone of Lord Kimberley's despatches—they were couched in an extremely cold tone, and showed throughout an absence of appreciation of Canadian rights. Take for instance that extraordinary reply to Mr. Campbell, who was urging that the Empire, in case of further Fenian troubles, should bear the burthen of resisting such attacks, and that Canada should only contribute as a portion of the Empire. Lord Kimberley suggested "that the present generation of Canadians were as responsible for the alleged wrongs of Ireland as the present generation of their fellow subjects residing in Great Britain." Even as respects the question of the Fisheries, Lord Kimberley said that "there might be some difference with regard to the interpretation of the Treaty as to Bays." The tone of indifference throughout was not at all satisfactory to those who looked for sympathy and support from the Mother Country. He must say he did not think the Hon. Postmaster General had accomplished as much as had been claimed. He did not see how we could be benefitted by having our rights mixed up with other questions of greater importance to England. It was said that whilst we were under the flag of Great Britain, there was no fear that she would forget her duty towards us. But we must not be more loyal than the Queen. We should consider what was due to our own self-respect. If we read the despatch of Lord Kimberley, it seemed as if there was a coolness in the sentiments of Great Britain towards Canada. Formerly it would have been high treason for any one in the Houses of Lords and Commons to declare that Great Britain could allow her connection with the colonies to be severed. Now Lord Kimberley must even go out of his way to say that "the Government did not wish to interfere with the freedom of Canada's future." Under all the circumstances, he had not much confidence that the Commission

would really protect our Fisheries. The interests of England rather than those of Canada would be considered.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER said that as one who had been generally designated as "the member for the Gulf Division" he felt bound to make a few remarks expressive of his gratification at the interest taken in one of the greatest natural resources of the Dominion. He had had his doubts last year whether the efforts of the Canadian fleet would be satisfactory to Canadian interests, but he must acknowledge now that its establishment was a wise and proper measure (hear, hear). He could not agree with those who anticipated that our rights would be sacrificed because the Fishery was mixed up with other questions. If war was to take place, to-morrow, respecting the *Alabama* claims, Canada would be the greatest sufferer, and she would be the battle ground; and therefore it was clearly our interest to have all causes of difficulty between England and the United States removed as soon as possible. It would be very impolitic on our part, were we, whilst the Commissioners were sitting, to allow the suspicion to be created that we would throw any obstacle in the way of an amicable adjustment of the questions between the two nations. For his own part, he had great confidence that the whole matter would be arranged so as to promote Canadian as well as Imperial interest.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL contended that, in view of the great interests at stake, Canadian as well as Imperial, a Commission was the best mode of arranging the questions in dispute. No time seemed more opportune than the present for a settlement. The American people were endeavoring to pay a war debt, and had hardly yet recovered from the effects of their civil strife. A few years later, when they had entirely recovered themselves and renewed their strength, the time might not be so opportune for an amicable adjustment of troublesome questions between England and the United States. If we had not asserted our rights respecting the Fisheries and repealed the license system, the Americans might, in course of time have raised a claim to them on account of their regular enjoyment of them. The longer we delayed the settlement of the question, the more we imperilled our interests. In asking for a Commission, the Government was largely actuated by a desire to take a course which would be most acceptable to Great Britain. It would have been a very serious responsibility to have pressed on England the necessity of any course that might have embroiled her

Hon. Mr. LeTellier de St. Just.

with the United States. The Government took the course open to them as an alternative—of referring the question to a Commission selected from each country, not for the purpose of concluding the rights of either party, but in order to point out the best mode of bringing about a settlement of the difficulties between the two nations. It was certainly wiser in England obtaining a settlement peaceably in the way proposed than by spending millions of treasure and wasting the lives of her people in an unnatural war, which might probably have occurred had she in an arbitrary manner decided to enforce her own view on a point the Americans differed from them. The only other alternatives were abandonment of our claims or a Commission. He repeated his belief that Canadian interests were safe in the hands of the Commission, one of the members of which was a Canadian Statesman who the House might rest assured would agree to nothing that would not meet with the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

After a few remarks from Hon. Messrs. Dickey and Letellier in explanation, the debate closed and the motion passed.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, Feb. 27, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:30 p. m.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HARRISON introduced a Bill to extend the law as to carrying dangerous weapons.

Mr. DREW introduced a Bill respecting County Court Judges.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for explanations.

Mr. DREW said that under the common law procedure Act of Ontario there was a provision that Superior Courts could refer matters of account to the County Court Judges to decide by summary procedure. The object of the Bill was to declare that they had no right in cases of that kind to make any charge, as they sometimes did at present.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said if that was the object of his hon. friend's bill, there was no necessity to introduce it. If there was no right to make such charges, there was no necessity for legislation in that direction. If a County Court Judge should make an illegal charge, and anyone should be foolish enough to pay it, that was a matter that could be easily disposed of.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member would bear in mind that the Judges were paid by the Dominion, and must be dealt with by this Parliament. If the Judges received anything beyond their salaries, it must be either legally or illegally. There would be no harm in discussing the matter, and it might be as well to allow the hon. member to introduce his measure.

The Bill was read a first time; second reading, on Thursday.

Mr. OLIVER introduced an Act to amend the Patent Act of 1869.

NEW WRIT FOR EAST RIDING OF HASTINGS.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that a new writ be issued for an election in the East Riding of Hastings, to return a member in place of the Hon. Robert Read, who has been summoned to the Senate.

ASSIMILATION OF LAWS, &c., FOR THE PROVINCES.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER laid before the House the preliminary report of Colonel Grey, with regard to the manner in which to carry out, as much as possible, the provisions of the British North America Act, by which it was provided, that the property and civil rights and laws in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick might be assimilated. The report submitted to the House, he said, was merely preliminary—to precede the appointment of a Commission with the object, if it should be thought proper, that the proceeding should be hereafter adopted. He might say at the outset, that this report must necessarily be productive of great good, it mattered not whether the assimilation took place or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE hoped the hon. member would not proceed with the discussion before the document was laid before the House. He did not believe it would be productive of the slightest good. He believed it was a vile job from beginning to end. (Cries of "order.")

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was sorry that his hon. friend had interrupted him. He was simply explaining the object of the report, nothing more. It was his duty to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Oh, yes; I have no objection to that, but I do object to the hon. member characterising it as an excellent report.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—I have a perfect right to say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Then I raise a point of order.

Hon. Mr. HOLT—If the hon. member on the other side of the House has a right to make a speech, so have I.

Mr. MACKENZIE—I doubt very much if he has ever read it. (Laughter.)

The report was laid on the table, and the discussion was dropped.

CORRECTION.

Mr. FORTIN wished to correct a mistake in the report of his speech on the fisheries question, which appeared in the *Times*. The printers had made him to say, "And, therefore, if any of our fishery rights are to be given up, a policy I am now prepared to recommend." (Laughter.) It should be, "I am not prepared to recommend." (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. MILLS—It is too bad to cheat the hon. member out of his T. (Laughter.)

DEATH OF ELZEAR GOULET, IN MANITOBA.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) asked whether the Government is aware that one Elzear Goulet, a Metis of the Province of Manitoba, met his death in the month of September last, in consequence of an assault or threats of assault, on the part of certain volunteers or soldiers forming part of the Military Expedition to the North West, and if so whether the Government have been put in possession of any documents, or other papers relating to an investigation, or to any other proceedings with a view to the discovery, trial or conviction, of the person or persons suspected of having been the cause of the death of the said Goulet.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the papers on the subject would form part of those moved for in connection with the North West Territory.

ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. BOLTON asked whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session a measure for the re-adjustment of the Electoral Divisions or districts in the Province of New Brunswick, the present division having only been claimed as temporary, and being at complete variance with the principle of representation by population?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was not the intention of the Government to alter the electoral divisions. After the census there would have to be a re-appointment of the representation.

PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. GODIN asked whether it is the intention of the Government to treat the decision of the Hon Messrs. Gray and McPherson, bearing date the 3rd September, 1870, in their capacity as Arbitrators appointed under Section 142 of the British North America Act, 1867, as a legal decision of the Arbitration Commission appointed in conformity with the said section, and in case the Government should treat the same decision as null and illegal, whether it is their intention to take steps to secure the consent, of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, for the appointment of a new Arbitration Commission, and failing such consent, whether it is the intention of the Government to take legal means to create a new Arbitration Commission?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government intended to inform the House by Wednesday or Thursday of its purpose in relation to the Arbitration question (cheers).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOURNIER asked whether it is the intention of the Government to make the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at Levis, so as to avoid the useless circuit it would be necessary to make in order to reach it, by using the line of the Grand Trunk?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied, the subject had been submitted to the Department of Public Works at different periods; but the Government had come to no decision about it. A correspondence took place between the town of Levis and the Government two or three years ago on the subject, which had been laid before the House.

PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS

Mr. DREW asked—have the Government made out an approximate statement of the result of the accounts between Canada and each Province, on Feb. 1st, 1871, adjusted on the footing of the award?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—The Government had made no such statement.

MOTIONS.

Mr. OLIVER moved for a return of the amount paid, etc., for the sale of stamps for the year ending June 30th, 1870.

Hon Mr. MORRIS asked what information the mover wanted. Was it merely as regards postage stamps or those and others?

Mr. Godin.

Mr. OLIVER—Postage stamps. Motion carried.

Mr. CONNELL moved for correspondence between the Dominion Government and that of New Brunswick relative to its unadjusted claims. He stated that a very great deal of dissatisfaction existed in New Brunswick in consequence of the non-settlement of that account. Whether the Dominion or the Local Government was to blame he could not say. So strong was the popular feeling on this subject, that at the last elections some of the Members lost their seats, and others were placed near the foot of the poll. While Quebec and Ontario had their claims settled, those of New Brunswick had been delayed from time to time. He wanted to know the cause of the trouble and bickering on this subject. His advice to the government, in order to have the difficultly settled between Ontario and Quebec, would be to take up the subject and deal with it, in a liberal and comprehensive manner. In the first instance, he would recommend that Ontario should form a basis of arrangement by which that Province could enter the Union with half the debt of the old Province of Canada, the other half being apportioned to Quebec. It would then become a Dominion debt and they would not be called upon to pay the interest. He would also recommend that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, should have their debt increased as they entered the Union, on the same basis as Ontario and Quebec. This would give to Nova Scotia, a certain increase, but any advanced amount received by New Brunswick or Nova Scotia or Quebec could be expended for railway purposes. This would benefit the trade and commerce of the Dominion, open up the country for settlement, and, in fact, would increase the revenue of the country and prove of very great benefit to the entire Dominion. If this course were adopted by the Government—and he would strongly advise them to pursue it—it would settle all the difficulties between Quebec and Ontario and put an end to these sectional divisions. He was always in favor of Confederation, but he believed that the principles on which it was now being worked out, would in the end prove disastrous to the Dominion. Each Province was quarreling and disputing about the aid it was to receive and clamoured for a large share, as was the case in Nova Scotia in which they were so successful. The manner in which they were treated was a direct encouragement for the Provinces to be continually finding fault, and in some cases, it was likely to lead to trouble yet. It might be objected to, the scheme he proposed, that it would throw a large debt on the Dominion, Let it be so. During last winter, (during the discussion on the tariff,) he did not object to the increase of taxation, so much as he did that New Brunswick had not received any benefit from it. There was no appropri-

tion of any kind to show that they had ever benefited in any way by the largely increased revenue that they were obliged to pay. He was an advocate of Confederation from the beginning and was so now. He desired to see Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia come into the Union on fair and equitable terms, but it was important that this question should be settled now and forever. Let the House adopt those principles of trade and commerce, those principles of internal improvement which would develop the interest of the country, increase Immigration, add to our manufactures and encourage the labor and industry of the Dominion. Let the Government Act, with energy and at once. Let them submit a broad and comprehensive measure, one that would commend itself to the people of this Dominion. Let an equality of expediture take place in the public improvements in all parts of the Dominion. If the Government would adopt such a policy, then Confederation would be a success (hear hear,) but if, on the other hand the present mode of proceeding was to be continued, the end must inevitably be disastrous.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY had no objection to lay the papers before the House. If, in the language of the member for Carleton, they would enable us to know ourselves, we should be under great obligations to the hon. member for having moved them.

Mr GODIN moved for the names of persons employed by the Local Governments in connection with the Commission of arbitration on the subject of the public debt of Quebec and Ontario. He said he understood an officer of the Dominion Government had accepted payment of \$1,000, from the Ontario Government for statements or calculations furnished for use in the arbitration.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government knew nothing of it—at least, he did not. He recommended the withdrawal of the motion, as there was little information to furnish, and no objection to give such as they possessed.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it seemed to him to have been a very unfortunate and indecent proceeding for one of the chief officials of the Ottawa Government to allow himself to be placed in the position of the paid officer of a Government interfering in matters of account in relation to the arbitrators. It had a tendency with other incidents connected with the arbitration, to bring it into contempt, when we found one of the chief officials of the Dominion making himself a party to a case in this way. He thought the House ought to express its opinion against such an intermission of duty for the future, and to ascertain whether Ministers were disposed to defend such conduct. The Min-

ister of Militia pleaded ignorance of the matter: but everyone knew the Ontario Government acknowledged having paid this sum of \$1,000. This state of affairs ought not to be allowed to continue. As a member representing to some extent the public opinion of Ontario, he felt bound to protest against such conduct on the part of Dominion officers. (Cheers.)

Sir GEO. E. CARTIER again protested he knew nothing of the matter. He had never read the budget speech of the Finance Minister of Ontario, because it was too long. (Laughter.) Every day we learned something new, and to-day such had been his experience.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU said if any of the employees of the Government of the Dominion were required before this arbitration, when they pretended they were approached in that capacity, they should not have acted without the permission of that Government; and if they had thought such officials should have gone—an opinion he thought they should not have held—they should have paid them themselves. The officials should not have been paid by the Ontario Government. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that he thought there could be no question, that gentlemen in the public service had no right to give their services at the request of any other parties whatever, and that any information desired by the Local Governments at the hands of the Government of the Dominion, ought to form the subject of an official communication, and he thought the proceeding in question, if it had occurred, was extremely irregular.

Mr. BLAKE (West Durham) thought there was a peculiar impropriety in an officer of the Dominion Government acting in connection with the Arbitration question, and even in any service whatever on account of the Local Governments, and he was surprised that such a service should have been performed by Mr. Simpson, and still more so that it should now be stated that the head of the Department was not aware of his having done so, and of his having received payments for having done so.

The motion was then passed and carried.

Mr. BLAKE then moved an address to His Excellency for copies of orders or directions made at any time under the Railway Act as to forms in which returns thereby required should be made up.

The motion being seconded by Mr. MACKENZIE was put and carried.

Mr. BLAKE then moved an address to His Excellency for copies of returns made by each Railway Company under the Railway Act of the late Province of Canada,

and the Railway Act of 1868, by which it is provided; that each of the Companies affected thereby shall in January and July in each year, make a true and particular return of accidents and casualties, whether to life or property. He said that many accounts had lately been heard of the unfortunate condition of one of the Railways in this country. On the one hand reports were made as to the very great irregularity which had occurred, and as to the very great number of accidents which had taken place, and as to the great amount of damage done, while on the other hand the most decided statements were made the other way. It was, however, certain that the public mind had been alarmed. It had been alleged that such reports were calculated to divert traffic from the Railway and injure it, and that such had already been the result, and he thought that it was very important that the truth of the matter should be ascertained by the production of the returns for which he had moved, so that the public mind might be soothed and the matter placed in a proper light.

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. YOUNG then said that he understood some correspondence had taken place between the Dominion Government and that of Nova Scotia in regard to the Provincial Building at Halifax, and, in fact, that there had been a very spicy dispute between the two Governments on the subject, and he thought it very desirable that the papers should be laid before the House, especially as one of the leading organs of the Government had alluded to the matter, in defence of the position taken by the Dominion Government. He therefore moved an address to His Excellency for copies of all correspondence on the subject.

Mr. SAVARY desired to call attention to the fact that he had on the notice paper a motion on the same subject, which, he thought, would meet the matter more fully than that moved by Mr. Young. It was well known that a dispute existed between the two Governments on the subject, and, in fact, a statement of the matter had been printed and largely distributed throughout Nova Scotia. As far as he understood the matter, the Local Government charged that of the Dominion with unjustly retaining the sum of about sixty or seventy thousand dollars, and whatever might be the facts of the case, there was no doubt that the Local Government was making a great deal of it, and it was therefore a proper subject for discussion in that House, in order that some conclusion might be arrived at,—and that it might be ascertained to what extent the

Local Government was correct. He would therefore ask Mr. Young to withdraw his motion, in order that he might make a more comprehensive one which would place the matter more fully before the House. He would move for the production of all papers connected with the matter including a statement of all monies paid on account of the building in question.

Mr. YOUNG said he had no objection to Mr. Savary making an addition to his motion so as to include the information he desired, but he thought it would be best to let his (Mr Young's) motion remain, when Mr. Savary's should come up in proper course.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that on the part of the Government there could be no possible objection to let the motion pass. He thought the whole question lay in a nutshell, as by an Act passed on the 22nd of June, 1869, which, however, the Government of Nova Scotia considered unconstitutional, it was provided, by clause 3, that Nova Scotia should, from the date of the completion of the new Province Building, be debited in account with Canada at the rate of 5 per cent per annum until it should be placed at the disposal of the Dominion, and he, as Minister of Finance, had been obliged to see that that provision was carried out. The Government of Nova Scotia, however, refused to make over the building except on certain conditions, which could not be entertained, as there was a further clause in the Act, which had emanated from the hon. and learned gentleman from West Durham, and had been assented to by the House, stating that the provisions made by that Act should be taken in full settlement of all demands of Nova Scotia on Canada, and he might add that the Government had been most careful not to commit itself in the matter, and they had not the least objection to the production of the papers.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he supposed the hon. gentleman meant to say that the Government had been most careful not to commit themselves by taking shelter under the provision moved by his hon. friend from West Durham, so that when any election or anything of that sort comes, they could say that they had not committed themselves, and so make an attempt to gain popularity.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS did not think it was possible to treat the matter as a matter of account, but he thought it would be quite competent for the Government to come down to the House, and ask them to vote the amount if legally due to the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SAVARY then said that he would

Mr. Blake.

move an amendment to Mr. Young's motion, for all papers in connection with the matter, and for a statement of all monies expended on the construction and completion of the building, and of all monies paid to the Government of Nova Scotia under 32, 33 Vic., Cap. 2. He was not aware that the Government of Nova Scotia claimed that the statute to which the Finance Minister had referred was unconstitutional, but they claimed that the third section had no reference to money expended by the Local Government on the completion of Provincial buildings since July 1st, 1867, and that the money so expended should be reimbursed by them. He did not charge the Dominion Government with any intention of keeping back anything to which the Local Government was entitled, but he thought the subject was a fair one for the consideration of the House, as it had been much agitated in Nova Scotia, and it was very important, therefore, that it should be considered and decided by the Dominion Parliament. The Local Government claims, in fact, that the Dominion Government has paid to the Province similar claims and demands, and that as the money had been expended subsequently to the 1st July, 1867, they had a just claim to reimbursement,—and indeed he had been informed that a distinguished member of the Opposition in that House had given a strong opinion that the Local Government was entitled to the amount.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought it was necessary that the House should have the papers before it, before it could pronounce intelligently on the matter, but from the statements of the mover of the amendment, the Nova Scotia Government seemed to have a fair claim to reimbursement of money expended since Confederation, and it seemed a case in which, though the terms of the Act seemed to prevent the payment, the Government might find it necessary to change the terms of the Act.

Hon. Mr. HOWE thought that when the papers were brought down the matter ought to be discussed fully and settled finally, but he deprecated any discussion under the present circumstances.

Hon. Mr. DORION had no recollection that anything had been said respecting this claim, on the occasion of the discussion on the subsidy to be paid to Nova Scotia.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER agreed with his hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Provinces, that the more appropriate time for discussing the question would be, when the papers had been brought down, but he thought the mem-

ber for Digby had fallen into the fallacy which had misled the Local Government, and as the late Finance Minister had sanctioned that fallacy by his opinion, he thought it right to state the grounds on which the Government had acted in the matter. The claim of the Local Government to the payment of the \$66,000 was founded on the fact; that they state, that after July 1st, 1867, they paid out of their revenue the \$66,000 towards the completion of the building, and that it was therefore unjust to include that amount in their debt, or to charge them with interest. The Minister of Finance had already stated, that when the Act was passed voting a large additional amount to Nova Scotia, that Act was burdened by a clause that, until the building was surrendered, the Government should charge five per cent. on the cost of the building. He held that there was no distinction between the \$122,000 paid on the building before Confederation and the \$66,000 after Confederation, and he would be delighted if his hon. friend from Sherbrooke would, by the weight of his great financial knowledge, support the view, that all contracts made by the old Governments were not chargeable to the Government making the contracts, for every one would remember that at the time of Confederation, they were building a railroad from Truro to Pictou, and that large sums of money were paid after the 1st of July, 1867 by the Dominion Government on the contract and charged to Nova Scotia.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that in the one case the money had been paid by the Dominion Government and the other by the Provincial Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that he need not tell the House that he would be the very last to stand in the way of a payment to Nova Scotia, but he thought the House should understand this matter. Under the Union Act, every contract that was made by any of the Provinces in relation to Public Works, became the property of the Dominion on the 1st July, 1867, but was it to be charged to the Dominion under the Act? The Act provided that while the Dominion should be responsible for the payment, every dollar should be charged to the debt of the Province that contracted the work. The Union Act provided also that every officer holding office under the Local Governments on the 1st July, 1867 became, in relation to every matter that came under the control of the Dominion Government, the officers of the Dominion, and therefore the Commissioners to build the Provincial Building at Halifax became in reality the Commissioners of the Dominion, and he held that in

reality the Building became the property of the Dominion Government at Confederation; but Nova Scotia having declared its intention to complete the building, its debt is \$66,000 less than if the money had come out of the Dominion purse. As the matter had thus been brought before the House, he thought it right to state what had been the difficulty placed in the way of the Dominion Government; but, he should only be too glad, for the sake of Nova Scotia, if the opinion of his hon. friend from Sherbrooke should obtain.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that after what had been said by the hon. gentleman from Cumberland, he thought they should certainly wait until they got the correspondence.

Mr. SAVARY'S amendment was then put and carried.

Mr. YOUNG moved for an address to His Excellency for correspondence between Hudson Bay Company and Government of Canada touching non-payment of purchase money for extinguishment of claims on North West Territory, &c. He thought it was advisable that *all* the correspondence in relation to the Hudson Bay Company, and their losses at Red River, should be brought down.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER replied all would be laid before the House with the papers, as well as a claim from the Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. YOUNG thought it was necessary to have all of the correspondence.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said it will all come.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BLAKE moved the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that any member of this House should for the future be engaged in the service of the Government of Canada in any paid employment, such as that in respect of which the Honorable John Hamilton Gray, member for the city and County of St. John, in 1868, entered into the receipt of three hundred dollars a month of the public monies." He said the events connected with the transaction to which he referred were fresh in the public mind, and it had become the general impression, that greater stringency was required to secure the independence of Parliament, without which members held their seats, not for the purpose of representing the people, but of enabling some few persons to govern them in spite of their wishes. Shortly after the first session of this present Parliament, the Act,

miscalled a Bill to establish the independence of Parliament, was introduced, and in spite of the protest of the Opposition it became law in its present objectionable shape. It was passed in the shape, that while it acknowledged the independence of members of this House, was likely to be sapped by a yearly salary, fee or emolument from the Government, it would not in the least be interfered with, only if the fee or salary was not annual. That was the distinction, that the independence of a member who was employed by the year at a yearly salary would be interfered with, but the independence of the member who was employed for two years at a two years' salary, or by the month at a monthly salary, would not be interfered with in the least. He agreed with the hon. members opposite that there was a distinction between them, but it had always appeared to him that the distinction was in favour of the man who was employed yearly, for then he might maintain his independence, but if employed by the month, he would be the more submissive servant (hear, hear, and laughter). The Opposition had endeavoured to prevent the law from passing in that shape, but were defeated. On subsequent occasions, when appointments were made which they considered objectionable, they protested against them but were defeated, and now, when this Parliament was about to close, and there had been ample evidence afforded of how badly the act worked, he ventured to appeal to the House to re-consider the question and to determine, guided not merely by reason, but by experience, that it was not expedient in future that a person in receipt of such emolument should have a seat in this chamber. There were instances of the fact, that a man need not have a long engagement, and yet remain a long time employed. The case to which he desired to apply a remedy was one in which a man held office for nearly, if not quite, two years. The hon. gentleman received large sums—sums which he thought would stagger the House when their attention should be called to them. For about two years the hon. member for St. John, while holding a seat in this House, received from the public funds as Commissioner, or in the employ of the Minister of Justice in the codification of the laws; or in some work for the Government, \$3,600; no, not that, only \$300 a month, which was equivalent to that amount per year, realizing for the two years a total of \$7,200. Then as arbitrator \$5,500 was paid him. He received what each member got, a sessional allowance of \$600 per year; \$1,200 for the two years. And there was the mileage too, the earned mileage (laughter) amounting to \$584. The hon.

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

gentleman received from the Government, then, in various ways, a total sum of \$14,484, while a private member of Parliament. He (Mr. Blake) would contrast this with the salary of a Crown Minister. The yearly salary of a Cabinet Minister was \$5,000, which with mileage amounted to less in two years than the amount received by the hon. member for St. John within the same time. It was time that there should be an end of this system. The House should solemnly declare that it had not conduced to the independence or the dignity of this Chamber, that its members should have been in the pay of the Ministry of the day, whether that pay were weekly, monthly or yearly. It did seem to him that there were plenty of gentlemen quite competent for the purposes of the Government (hear, hear), and to such men it should be left, or that hon. members who wished to pick up these crumbs from the public table should resign their seats in the House. It seemed to him that the Act recognized, but in the wrong way, that the distinction between monthly and yearly hire had produced injurious results and should be amended for the future. He had no desire to make personal attacks on any hon. gentleman, but when the hon. member from St. John sat in this House holding an office of emolument under the Government, he should expect such criticism. He had no objection that the hon. member should be employed. He understood to-day that the hon. member had ceased to be employed. He (Mr. Blake) was glad of it, for it now left the House clear of this case, and for his own part, he could say sincerely, that he desired if the hon. member wished to be employed in the public service, that he should receive such share of the patronage of the House as he was fit to earn—always on condition that the hon. member ceased to hold a seat in this House while so employed. Long might his gallant bosom swell, long might his waistcoat pocket fill with the streams from the treasury benches, but not while he represented the people here (laughter). He (Mr. Blake) submitted his motion on which he proposed to found a Bill to carry out the great reform which was so much needed.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said it ought to be fresh in the memory of every hon. member in the House, the circumstances under which the present Bill was passed. The old Parliament of Canada had had ample experience of the Independence of Parliament Act to which the hon. member for West Durham had alluded. It had been amended from time to time till it had reached a state of perfection which com-

mended it to the inhabitants of the late Province of Canada. He thought that Act worked well. On several occasions the members of the successive Governments which held office before the Confederation, had often felt it too stringent when the services of the hon. members were required for special purposes for which they were fitted. It had only been adopted after a long discussion, and it was afterwards deemed expedient to strike out the word "temporary," in order that the Government should not be deprived of the advantage which might be derived from employing hon. members in such cases. If his memory served him right, there was no division on that amendment in this House. Its necessity was felt by all. Quite recently, under Mr. Gladstone's Government, Sir Stafford Northcote, had been asked to act as Commissioner at Washington, and the Parliament were not opposed to it. It was not considered by any member that such a proceeding was like bribery, which might be calculated to degrade a member of the House. There was a circumstance which came to his (Sir George's) knowledge when he was in England in 1858. The Government called on Mr. Gladstone, who was in the Opposition, to investigate matters which took place at the Ionian Islands. He would tell the hon. member for West Durham, and the House, that when the Independence Act was passed in this House in 1868, there was no intention on the part of this Government to obtain any privilege which had not been already enjoyed by the English Government. We had the same privilege given by Parliament. Government is not to be deprived of the temporary services of hon. members of the House who may be peculiarly fitted for certain services under the law of the land, and he wanted the country to understand that he had not acted in regard to these appointments in the way the motion of the hon. member for West Durham seemed to point out. He would tell that hon. member, that the Government had considered the question, and that they were going to bring down a measure with regard to the Act passed in 1868, in reference to the independence of Parliament, to amend it in such a way as to bring it in as it was formerly under the legislative system in the late Province of Canada. [Hear hear.] He hoped his hon. friend would not press his motion, if he did so, he (Sir George) would introduce an amendment that would carry out his views on the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE said there had been a division in the House, and there had been two or three divisions since then on motions made by himself on this very matter.

In these motions he had not mentioned the name of the hon. member for St. John, because he did not wish to make them in any way personal, or to pain any member of this House. A motion, however, to the same effect as the one before them was defeated, and it would be remembered that last session, the opposition failed by only eight votes to carry a resolution which he (Mr. Mackenzie) had proposed, so that the hon. gentleman could not say that he ever had the slightest countenance or support in those transgressions of a good public law, from the Opposition side of the House. They had taken a consistent course on this matter throughout, and now, he was glad to see that the hon. gentleman was compelled by the gross immorality of the Act and by the force of public opinion to put an end to a system which had proved to be a scandal and disgrace to this Legislature. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. SAVARY said he was about to move that all the words in the resolution after "employment," be struck out. He could not see, whatever feeling the hon. member for Durham might have in the matter, now that the term of employment of the honourable member for St. John had ceased, why that gentleman should be referred to in particular, or why an ungracious allusion to any honourable member in this House, should be allowed to go on the journals in such a manner. He thought the views of the honourable member for Durham would be met, and the resolution would have a wider and more effectual scope if amended as he (Mr. Savary) proposed. He was not opposed to the principle which the honourable member desired to lay down, where the employment of any honourable gentleman was similar to that alluded to. He could not see why the House should limit the resolution to one case. He should prefer to apply it to all cases. He therefore, moved that all the words in the original resolution after the word "employment" be struck out.

Mr. BOWELL said the motion now in hand was a correct one, and he was glad to hear the Minister of Militia say it was intended to alter the Independence of Parliament Act so as to exclude this class of employees. If the member for West Durham withdrew his motion, he had no objection to withdraw his amendment.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER after examining the votes and proceedings for 1868, said the amendment proposed by the Opposition had escaped his memory. The amendment had not encountered stern opposition from the Government owing to the temper in which it was proposed, and the tone of the debate. He

was sorry the member for West Durham had not agreed to withdraw his motion after the Government promised to amend the Act. They kept their word. He might take credit for forestalling the Government, but they had considered the matter before. He would move in amendment that all the words after "that" in the amendment be expunged, so as to make the motion read thus: "That the House would give the best consideration to any measure that might be introduced, having for its object the further securing of the Independence of Parliament."

Mr. MILLS said the main motion was important. The reasons existing for the exclusion of the parties mentioned in the Act of 1868, were as strong against the employment of parties not thereby excluded as in the English Act securing the Independence of Parliament, what was necessary there, would not suffice for the same object in Canada. The members in this country were of different circumstances from those in the English members, who were a plutocracy. Our position being different from that of the English people, in this respect, demands different safeguards. Our Governments should not be able to employ members of Parliament. It was no longer possible to influence English as it was Canadian members. What has happened within the last two years to give the Government information it did not before possess? Was there any Commission or event apart from the Intercolonial Commission, or the arbitration within this period to instance, in support of a new policy apart from those mentioned in the motion. The Government's course was not unselfish. They had lost influence, and having a prospect of some being kicked out of office, did not like their successors to possess the advantages in the way of patronage possessed by themselves (hear, hear and laughter). He argued there was no good reason against the motion.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON contended the Act did not apply to the member for St. John, and that the Government had power to appoint him on the Commission. If his case had come within the Act, a motion might have been proposed to make him vacate his seat. He did not clearly understand the object of the motion. If it was intended to change the whole character of the Act, and restore it to its old condition, that was one thing, or if it was intended merely to embrace a particular case, that was another. Neither did the Minister of Militia clearly explain what course the Government intended. No doubt a large sum had been

Mr. Mackenzie.

disbursed under the arrangements aimed at by the resolution. Yet, in England larger sums still had been paid by Governments to Commissioners like the member for St. John, and even to gentlemen selected out of opposite parties. Dr. Bowring received for a period of service not longer than that of this hon. gentleman, upwards of eleven thousand pounds sterling. Franklin Lewis and Mr. Blackburn, when chairmen of like Commissions, received large sums, and Mr. Cobden was paid a good deal of money for his labours in connection with the French treaty. At this moment there were more than forty members of the English House of Commons receiving emoluments for services. When Mr. Gladstone went to the Ionian Islands his expenses reached within a fraction of £2,000. Sir Stafford Northcote had been appointed a member of the Joint High Commission by the Government of the party opposed to his own. It might be said these appointments in Canada were daring attempts to corrupt members; but they had the usage of the Imperial Parliament for a course adopted by the Liberals as well as the Conservatives. It the Act here was to be changed, Parliament ought to be informed in what way, and whether it would affect parties receiving monthly salaries, so far as the hon. member particularly affected by this motion was concerned. The item paid him came down and received the sanction of Parliament, and that having been done, if a change had been made at all, it must have been made without the slightest reference to him. We had now from the Minister of Militia a promise that the Act was to be amended, but how it was to be amended we were not told.

It being now six o'clock, the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) always understood that the intention of the law was to prevent sitting members from accepting salaries for services. It was argued that the law applied only to parties receiving yearly salaries. He believed, however, the Act ought to be amended so as to prevent the acceptance of salaries or payments by members for services rendered. But as the law stood, he thought the Government had acted regularly. As the Government promised to amend the statute, he would vote against the amendment of the member for West Durham.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said it was quite true that members of Parliament, in England, were often selected for service on Commissions, and paid for their labours, and that Ministers frequently

chose political opponents without its being considered that their subsequent votes were thereby likely to be influenced. It would appear, however, from the position of parties in this country, that such may not be the case; and if it were true that it was necessary to the independence of Parliament, that persons who had a yearly salary by virtue of a Commission from the Crown, were incapacitated, from the supposition that they might be under the influence of the Government of the day—if it were necessary to have such a provision to protect the independence of the members of the House—a *fortiori*—it must be necessary to protect that of members employed casually and paid from day to day or month to month. There were two occasions on which he had sided in support of the view, that it was contrary to the spirit of the Independence Act that persons should occupy that position. He voted, however, against the proposition of the member for West Durham, which went far beyond the substance of the proposition contained in the present main motion. He had included in his former motion many persons not holding office under the Crown in Canada, but holding office under the Crown in any portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. Certainly, persons in the different Provinces, like himself, holding office under the Local Government were included in the motion. He could not vote for the present motion. He thought he detected as its motive a spirit of malevolence, not creditable to any hon. gentleman whether in or out of this House. (Cheers and counter cheers.) He saw no difficulty in the mover attaining his end in a way different from the present, without attempting to fix upon the journals an imputation of infamy in connection with an honourable gentleman. Far better to have introduced a motion affirming an abstract principle of universal application, such as, that it was inadvisable a sitting member should be appointed to a position of emolument by the Government of the day. He would vote against the motion and for the amendment of Sir Geo. Cartier. The other amendment was faulty with reference to monthly payments and employments. The principle desirable, should prevent the Government from employing any one in any service in which he got pay. (Cheers.)

Mr. BLAKE, after replying to some personal allusions in the speech of Mr. Wood, noticed that it would have been better to have proposed an abstract principle without the illustration. He said he would have been delighted if he thought he could have carried it without the illustration. (Cheers.) His opinion was, and he

thought this night had proved it, that the best way of carrying an abstract principle, was to impress on the House the importance of it, by embodying in the resolution the illustration of its importance, (cheers). If his motion had been framed in any different way, he would not have been met by the proposition of the Government, to concede the sense of his motion, against which they had voted three sessions, (hear, hear). He was not disposed, holding he had put on the journals an admirable resolution, which could not be amended either in matter or manner, to prevent the House from pronouncing on the principle of it as it stood, in favour of the milk and water amendment of Sir Geo. E. Cartier. It did not commit the House or Government to the passage of any measure, but merely promised to consider any measure brought down. He declined altogether to exchange his straightforward, plain resolution, affirming an indisputable principle, for the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia, which meant nothing at all. He would ask that the votes of the House be recorded, (cheers).

A division on the amendment of Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

YEAS — Archambeault, Ault, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bown, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron, (Inverness) Cameron (Peel), Carmichael, Caron, Cartier Sir Geo. E., Caley, Chauveau, Chipman, Coffin, Collbey, Costigan, Dobie, Drew, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Grover, Harrison, Hincks Sir Francis, Holmes, Howe, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Killam, Lacerte, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish) McDonald (Middlesex), Masson, (Soulanges,) Masson, (Terrebonne,) McMillan, Morris, Morrison, (Niagara,) Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain,) Ross (Dundas) Ross (Victoria, N. S.) Ryan, (Montreal East), Savary, Shanly, Simard, Smith, Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Simpson, Tilley, Pourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Willson, Wood, Workman, Wright, (Ottawa County),—83.

NAYS—Béchar, Blake, Bodwell, Bowell, Bowman, Cameron, (Huron), Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Connell, Coupal, Crawford, (Brockville), Delorme, Dorion, Dufresne, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt, Sir A. T. Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones, (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, McDonald, (Glengarry), McFarlane, McKenzie, Magill, McCallum, McConkey, McDougall, (Lanark,) McMonies, Mills, Moffatt, Morrison, (Victoria), Munroe, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Pozer, Redford, Ross,

Mr. Blake.

(Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Sriver, Snider, Stirton, Thompson, (Haldimand), Thompson, (Ontario), Tremblay, Wells, White, Whitehead, Wright, (York, Ont.), Young.—58.

MOTIONS.

Mr. BLAKE moved an address to His Excellency for copies of correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, and between the Governments of Canada and any of the Provinces, touching any Acts of the Legislature of Canada or of any of the Provincial Legislatures. He explained that the object was to ascertain which of the Acts of any of the Legislatures had become the subject of comment on the part of the Imperial authorities, with regard to disallowance or amendment.

The motion was carried.

Mr. MACKENZIE then moved an address for copies of correspondence of the Canadian with the Imperial Government concerning the claims of Canada against the United States, arising from the Fenian raids, together with copies of all Orders in Council and documents relating to the same. The House had been informed a few days ago, that there was such correspondence, that a certain account had been sent to the Imperial Government, and he moved for the papers so that the House might see the exact position of the matter.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said that he thought when the hon. gentleman considered the delicacy of the matter, the fact that the correspondence was not entirely closed, he would see the impropriety of his motion, and on behalf of the Government he must state that they did not feel justified in bringing down the papers asked for, as they did not think it would be conducive to the public interests.

Mr. MACKENZIE very much regretted that the Minister of Militia had taken the grounds he had taken, as the House had been distinctly led to believe that at least a portion of the correspondence would be brought down.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Certainly not.

Mr. MACKENZIE—The hon. gentleman ought not to be too positive in contradicting statements. He had certainly understood that some of the papers would be brought down, and when it had been said that the statement in question had been made and sent in, he had given notice that he should ask for the papers, and now when he made the motion he was told by the Minister of Militia that it would not be conducive to the public interests that the

statement should be brought down. Of course, as the Ministry had assumed the responsibility of making that statement he should not divide the House, but he must protest against every request being met with such an answer. Part of the proceedings had already been published, and if they waited a few days they might find the remainder in an Imperial Blue Book. Surely it was a matter of consequence that the people should know what the claims of Canada were, and the way in which the Government had urged them.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said he was very much astonished at the notion of the member for Lambton, and he would venture to say that the hon. gentleman could not point out a single instance in Imperial practice where papers relating to negotiations with foreign Governments had been laid before the House, and it must be seen that nothing could possibly be more injurious than such a proceeding in the present instance.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that on the contrary, he would show the honourable gentleman on the morrow numerous instances in Imperial practice of papers in such cases being brought down. He might mention, that in the case of the present High Commission, the English Government had even furnished the newspapers, beforehand, with the basis on which the Commission was to proceed, and he was certainly amused to hear the hon. gentleman make such an extraordinary statement.

Mr. JONES (Leeds and Grenville) was equally surprised to hear such a statement from the member for Lambton, and he had good reasons for entertaining that surprise. He thought he understood something of constitutional practice in England, and could fully corroborate the statement of the Hon. the Finance Minister, and wherever it had been stated that the production of any papers would be detrimental to the public interest, such production was never urged.

Mr. BLAKE said Lord Kimberley had required the Canadian Government to send a statement of the claims of Canada in respect of the Fenian raids for transmission to the American Government, and couched in such terms as would render it fit for transmission to that Government. The Canadian Government had transmitted that statement, when, he did not know, but they were told that it had been transmitted. It had been framed expressly for the purpose of being communicated to the United States, following on that the Commission had been arranged, and was about to sit, and as there could be nothing in the statement unfit for the American Govern-

ment, as it had been framed expressly for them, surely there could be nothing in it unfit to be submitted to the people of Canada. And yet they were to be left in entire ignorance of the way in which their claims had been set forth and urged, as such a proceeding "*would be injurious to the public interests.*" There was nothing confidential about the paper, nothing secret, nothing private. It was intended to be presented by the Imperial Government to that of the United States, and he certainly thought the hon. gentlemen could not refuse to produce it on the ground of expediency in the public interests. Such a reason might apply were the whole of the papers asked for, but if the hon. gentlemen persevered in refusing the particular document asked for, he thought they were bound to give some special explanation of their reasons for so doing.

Hon. J. HILLYARD CAMERON thought that the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had answered his own argument. He had admitted the general principle that Ministers were justified in refusing papers, the production of which they considered would be detrimental to the public interests, and he had stated no reasons why that principle should be departed from in the present instance. It was not simply one particular document that was asked for, but the whole of the correspondence, and after the Minister of Militia had stated that their production "*would be injurious to the public interest,*" by what possible right could the House urge the matter further. They on that side of the House, took the statements of the Government, and believed them, and when the Government declared that the production of the papers would, in their judgment, be prejudicial to the interests of the country, he thought the House was bound to believe and accept the statement.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, that as a general rule the Ministers should judge as to the propriety of submitting correspondence, but he thought it was hardly fair to ask the House on every occasion to submit to a simple statement as to "*public interests*" without a word of explanation. It was notorious that claims did exist, there was no secret as far as that was concerned, and he thought there could be no reason for withholding particulars of the account which had been preferred, and the mode in which it had been urged. The statement might have been a very inadequate one. If he remembered aright the Premier had told them that the matter of these claims was not among those to be submitted to the High Commission. If

however, the Government could tell the House that these claims would be considered by the Commission, then he could understand the propriety of withholding the papers, but under the present circumstances of the case, the members of that House, as representatives of the people, had a right to express their opinion as to the manner in which the claims of the people had been put forward. There might be some papers which it would be inexpedient to submit, and those might be withheld, but they certainly ought to have the statement, and though admitting the propriety of submitting to the decision of Ministers in such matters, as a general rule he was not one to submit to a simple statement repeated on every occasion without comment or explanation.

Mr. CONNELL thought that many additions might have to be made in the claim, and then the particular paper in question should be submitted.

Hon. E. B. WOOD said he could concur in many reasons why it might be injudicious to bring the matter before the House, although it might not be that the subject of compensation for the Fenian raids would be brought before the High Commission, yet it might be very inadvisable to make public statements which might tend to influence the minds of the people of the United States, and so very much embarrass the action of the Commission, and he was certainly astonished that men of the great experience of the members for Lanark, West Durham, and Lambton, should so earnestly press the Government to produce papers which they must see it would be most unadvisable to bring down, at the present time, under any and all circumstances.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that not being gifted with the unusual reasoning powers, and good judgment of the member who had just spoken (hon. Mr. Wood—that's a fact, laughter,) they ought to have some forbearance for him, but if the hon. gentleman was to be their political school-master he feared the House would not improve in manners, judgment, or good sense. He did not intend to divide the House on his motion, but he felt bound to protest against the course taken by the Government. As to what the last speaker had said about inflaming the minds of the people of the United States, that was beneath contempt. It was well known that the American Government had published full minutæ of the "Alabama" claims, and who had ever thought of its having any effect on the Canadian mind. The claims on account of the Fenian Raids would have to be adjudicated upon,

Hon. Mr. McDougall.

and why should Canadians be afraid of letting the United States know what their claims were. He would, however, defer to the judgment of the honourable gentlemen opposite and withdraw his motion.

Motion accordingly withdrawn.

Mr. MAGILL said you are all aware that during the past season the people of this country had been called upon to restore law and order in the North West. Too much praise could not be awarded them for the readiness with which they had undertaken this duty. Willingly they had come forward to offer their lives a sacrifice on the altar of their country, (hear, hear). It was well known that the Wesleyan Methodists formed one of the most numerous and respectable church bodies in this country, and great discontent and dissatisfaction arose when it was reported that that body had not been treated with due respect by the Government. He hoped there were no Jonahs in the camp. He thought this was a proper time to bring this subject before the House, that a prompt opportunity might be afforded the Hon. Minister of Militia to set the matter at rest. We had no church and state in this country, and the very fact that this great advantage had been obtained by us, by hard fought battles, made us jealous of our rights. There was no such thing as any one class being put over the other, all were pleased with an equality. When the expedition was sent to the Red River last summer, some of the members of the Wesleyan body joined the expedition. It was proposed that one of the missionaries of the Wesleyan body should be sent with the forces as a Chaplain. A communication was sent to the Hon. Minister of Militia asking to be allowed that privilege. The Rev. Mr. Punshon was the gentleman who, on behalf of the body, made the application. A gentleman well known as an eminent Divine, not only in this Dominion but in the British Empire. The answer of the Honourable Minister of Militia to that reverend gentleman, was said to be very uncourteous—this he could not from his knowledge of that hon. gentleman believe. The matter had however obtained so much notoriety as to be brought before the conference at Toronto. He did not stand up here as a vindicator of the Methodist body, he would do the same for any other denomination. He would move an address to His Excellency, asking for a correspondence between Dominion Government and Rev. W. M. Punshon and others, in reference to appointment of Chaplain to accompany Military Expedition to Manitoba.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he was delighted that the hon. gentleman had

brought his motion before the House. Unfortunately, a member of the Government—a Minister of the Crown—was obliged to do his duty, and be silent often when assailed even in the most unexpected place. He recollected about the 17th of June last, he (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) made an appointment to meet the Hon. Sir A. T. Galt in Montreal, who then apprised him that the Methodist conference was sitting in Toronto; and that some extraordinary statement had been made about the appointment of a Chaplain to the Red River Expedition. He was not able to find out what amount of trouble there was with regard to the Chaplain for that force from his friend, Hon. Sir A. T. Galt (who was always a friend of his.) The news was merely telegraphic and came from Toronto to Montreal. It was to the effect that a statement had been made in Toronto by a rev. gentleman that Sir. Geo. E. Cartier had appropriated 1,000,000 acres for the priests and clergy of Manitoba, that he would not listen to a petition sent on behalf of the Methodist clergy, for the appointment of a Methodist chaplain to accompany the volunteers from Ontario, and, besides, he had sent twelve priests to accompany the expedition, while the poor Methodist clergyman could not obtain leave to go.

Mr. MILLS—Who said that?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he would explain all that. He felt more surprised than any one could imagine when he learned these things, that such a large appropriation had been made, that he had sent an army of priests to accompany the expedition, and had refused permission for a Methodist clergyman to go with them, and, above all, that a Methodist deputation had been discourteously received. He could do nothing more than telegraph to a colleague of his, who happened to be in Toronto at the time, to ask if it was really so, and requesting him to send a true explanation of the affair. He (Sir George) might say he felt uneasy about these false statements which had been made against him. He felt uneasy that the people of Lower Canada and the Roman Catholic clergy, who were renowned for their liberality, should imagine that he had inflicted an injustice on a body of Protestants (hear, hear). He felt uneasy, too, lest the Protestants of Canada should fancy that he had abused his position as a Minister of the Crown to serve the interests of a particular party or creed. As a Minister of the Crown, he knew neither Protestant nor Catholic, Upper Canada or Lower Canada. He held the position to deal impartially towards all. He might add, too, that there was no Protestant

denomination amongst whom he had so many personal friends as the Methodists, in Montreal especially. Those who knew him would not believe that he could be guilty of dealing unjustly with so respectable a denomination. He was not in a position at the time to justify himself, and he was decried right and left. On his way to Ottawa he fell in with a copy of the *Globe*, in which he saw a (little article dedicated to him on the subject. It referred to a letter from Rev. W. Punshon. Until then he had no idea to what an extent he (Sir George) had been slandered in Toronto. The *Globe* stated that no insult had been offered in the correspondence, to Rev. W. Punshon. He (Sir George) then read the letter of the rev. gentleman himself, and he should have been pleased to have made the personal acquaintance of one whose letter showed him to be, not only a good Christian, but a true gentleman. In that communication, the Rev. W. Punshon had replied to some previous remark of the *Globe*, that the complaint against the Hon. Minister of Militia was not as stated. He continued, "Our grievance against him is this: We sent in our application and received a letter of acknowledgment. Our complaint is, that, after we had received that letter, we never received another communication to tell us if our petition had been considered by the Government!" He (Sir George) did not often keep the *Globe*, but he kept that copy, and determined to himself that when the discussion should be out of the newspapers, he would take it on himself to write to the Rev. W. Punshon privately, explaining the circumstances of the appointment of the Chaplain, and the reason why the correspondence which he expected had not been sent to him. That correspondence was, of course, private, and he was not at liberty to say what it contained, but he would take this opportunity to explain to the House the circumstances attending the appointment of the two Chaplains to the Volunteer Force. By an Order in Council, passed several weeks before the departure of the troops, the number of non-combatant officers to accompany the two battalions was determined. This was gazetted. There were several applications from revd. gentlemen, both by letter and personally for the position of chaplains of the Battalions. The two gentlemen selected were Rev. Mr. Patterson and Father Ouillet. Their appointments were gazetted and anyone who wished to know who had obtained the positions could have seen it in the *Canada Gazette*. Subsequent to this he read a resolution which was passed at a Methodist conference in Toronto, and reported by the *Globe* and *Telegraph* of that

city, which were very hostile to him, he knew not why. He was, as it were a scape goat, and they represented him as black as they possibly could. He saw in the report of the Conference that a resolution had been actually drafted by a rev. gentleman, endorsing the most unwarrantable statements against him (Sir George). In that resolution it was said that he had appropriated 1,400,000 acres to support the priests at Red River. He did not remember whether this statement had been made in the resolution itself or in the speech of the rev. mover, but at all events he (Sir George) had been slandered right and left. He stated in his letter to Rev. W. Punshon that he repudiated these charges entirely, and he hoped an opportunity would be afforded him to refute them in Parliament. This was a delicate matter, but if hon. members opposite wished to appoint a committee and investigate it thoroughly he would be glad of it. He would like too, that certain gentlemen who had made such statements should be brought before that committee, and state on what authority they preferred such charges. He was well known to a large number of the Methodist, and he was satisfied that they knew too well his liberality, fairness, and honesty, to think that he could be guilty of anything derogatory either to them or any other Protestant denomination.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he understood rather differently. During the discussion on the resolution, he had the pleasure to be present at the Methodist Conference, and he understood by the remarks of the Rev. Dr. Ryerson, that in moving this resolution they only wished to express their disapproval of the mode of appointing the chaplains. They had asked permission to send a chaplain of their own faith to accompany the expedition, only requesting the Government to furnish conveyance for him and his baggage, and the indignation was directed against the refusal of the hon. Minister of Militia to allow them to send a chaplain at their own cost.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said if any one ought to be conversant with military affairs it was the gallant Major Mackenzie, the hon. member for Lambton. [Laughter.] The Canadian battalions once organized and officered, were placed under the command of General Lindsay, the Commander of the expedition, and the Government had nothing further to do with them, and could not grant the request.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said, like the hon. member for Lambton, he had heard a

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

discussion very interesting to him was about to take place at the Methodist Conference, an assembly of 500, among the most respectable men in the country. He was present in the gallery during that discussion, and he could not say there were such statements made as had been asserted in the House to-night. He had listened very attentively to the very able speech of Dr. Ryerson on that occasion. He had heard the remarks respecting the Hon. Minister of Militia, and he did not hear such statements made as the hon. gentleman complained of. He had heard nothing said that was not perfectly justifiable in view of the events which had since then transpired in connection with Manitoba. Then, with regard to the appointment of the chaplains, the hon. Minister of Militia had sheltered himself under the order in Council, but who determined that only two chaplains should be sent? Who determined that there should be but two chaplains, one from the church of Rome, and the other from the church of England? The objection made was, that such a decision had been arrived at. The objection was, that they were not prepared to assert that this large and influential body having ministers of their own residing in that country, having a large number professing their own religion among the volunteers, should not be allowed to send a chaplain with the expedition to minister to their spiritual wants. It was against the discourtesy of the reply merely, refusing to permit them to send a chaplain at their own expense. He must do justice to the Rev. Doctor Ryerson; it is true that gentleman was not named, but there was no doubt that he was the rev. gentleman referred to by the Hon. Minister of Militia. Dr. Ryerson was too well acquainted with public life not to know, that such grave statements should only be made on sufficient grounds. It had been reported that he said twelve Roman Catholic priests had been sent with the expedition. He (Dr. Ryerson) made no such statement. What he did say, was, that twelve Roman Catholic chaplains had been attached to the Volunteer force of the country.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—That's not the case!

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—It might be true or not, but that was the statement made by the rev. gentleman. Then the Hon. Minister of Militia had said a great deal about the statement that one million four hundred thousand acres of land had been appropriated for the benefit of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Manitoba. He did not believe that any such statement was made, (here the hon. gentleman

referred to a fyle of the *Globe*, from which he read the resolutions referred to). The statement in these resolutions was that the Hon. Minister of Militia had set apart 1,400,000 acres of land, chiefly for the priests and his co-religionists, and this statement could be borne out by facts (cries of oh! oh! from Sir George and the French members), and all the facts developed in that country since the resolutions were moved in the Conference, confirmed the correctness of the statement. Was it not true that the reserves which the Manitoba Bill directed should be made under this Government in that Province, were under the control of the priesthood, and that it was chiefly for the benefit and support of the hon. member's co-religionists? It was a fact, and could not be disputed. (Sir George, No! No!) The hon. gentleman said no, no, but were not his co-religionists in the majority there. They had the control of the Government, the Bishop of St. Boniface was the actual ruler of that Government, and his influence was supreme. [Cries of Oh! and No! no! from various members.] Those associated with him, and who were under his direction, were the people who ruled. He knew by letters recently received from that country written by officers of the Volunteer Force, and by private members of that force, that it was so. It was clear that the influence of the Bishop was predominant—that nothing could be done with the Government without his assent; that no man could get employment from the Government unless he first went to the Bishop of St. Boniface, and got him to use his influence in his favour. That was said as a fact on the best authority. The Hon. Minister of Militia might laugh and attempt to deny it, but (excitedly) he (Mr. McDougall) knew better what he heard stated by a member of this House! What he had heard by letters from Manitoba! What he saw in the papers every day corroborated the statements made in the resolution. The hon. gentleman had charged that it was a misrepresentation of facts, and that the Conference was not justified in coming to the conclusion it did. He admitted, if the influence of the Bishop was not predominant; if the clergy of his Church were not interfering in the control of public affairs in Manitoba, there might be some blame attached to the members of the Conference, but under the circumstances he contended that the Conference, in supporting Dr. Ryerson, in view of the events that have since occurred, were fully justified in stating that these reserves were made for the co-religionists of the Hon. Minister of Militia. All the facts went to show that there was no

ground for charging the Conference with misrepresentation of facts. The House had been told that the correspondence had been private. The hon. gentleman had chosen, though writing upon matters of public importance, to mark his communications "Private," and hence they were not to be submitted to the House. They could not tell what explanations had been made, or what inducement had been held out to Rev. M. Punshon to repeal the resolutions. There would be no doubt some curious revelations if those letters were furnished to the House, but they were told the communications were private, and they would be no wiser for the motion of his hon. friend to have the correspondence brought down.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said he had not intended to enter into a discussion upon the proceedings of that conference, nor had he intended to mention the name of Dr. Ryerson. It was not he who had introduced that gentleman's name into the discussion. He had written privately to Mr. Punshon in reply to the letter of that rev. gentleman, because it was a communication from a Christian and a gentleman, and he congratulated the Methodist denomination on having such a man amongst their number. What he (Sir George) complained of, was, that unwarrantable statements had been made in a resolution by one of the rev. gentlemen at the conference. He knew that if only Dr. Ryerson had heard what his hon. friend had said he would have at once made use of the proverb: "Save me from my friends."

Mr. FERGUSON—The matter was one which had been discussed throughout the country, and he therefore desired to make a few remarks on it. He thought there was no doubt that Dr. Ryerson, however sincere, had led his people astray on this matter very considerably, and he was quite sure that if anything offensive had emanated from the Department of the Minister of Militia, it had been sent without his consent or knowledge. It had no doubt been considered that the expedition should be accompanied by two Chaplains, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, and he was quite sure that the Wesleyans were now satisfied that no offence had been intended. Very much had been said as to land being appropriated for the benefit of the priests and co-religionists of the Minister of Militia, but nothing of the kind had been done. The priests and co-religionists of the Minister of Militia had been treated in no way differently from other classes of the people. He then read the clauses of the Manitoba Act respecting the land appropriation,

shewing that it was in no way for the Roman Catholics but for the half-breeds, and said he did not think there was now a single Methodist minister who did not believe that the priests had no control whatever over the lands of Manitoba. Every land grant had to be published in the *Canada Gazette*, and therefore nothing could be done privately or in an underhand way,—and in fact he did not hesitate to say that no Government that gave one party preference over another could stand for one moment. As to the predominance of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba, he had it on the authority of Drs. Schultz and Lynch, that out of every ten, six were Protestant of one denomination or another, and out of the twenty-four members elected to the Local Legislature, thirteen were Protestant and eleven Catholic. He (Mr. Ferguson) felt satisfied that if his hon. friend from Hamilton agreed to the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of Militia for a Committee of Enquiry, it would meet the approval of the public, and justice would be accorded to all parties, it placed this honourable House in a position to approve or condemn—the action of the Government in the premises as they deserved—and to this end he would suggest to the Hon. Minister of Militia, the propriety of obtaining permission from the Rev. Dr. Punshon to produce the private letters which passed between himself and the reverend gentleman on this important subject. He was satisfied that if his friend agreed to the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of Militia for a Commission, and witnesses were brought before it, justice could be done.

Hon. Mr. HOWE would have much preferred the hon. gentleman had waited till the papers were brought down, when all the matters connected with this subject could have been discussed. Already we had had two or three discussions on this subject in the absence of the papers. He and the Government had been denounced for their course in regard to the North West, and he himself, by a wretched rag of a paper in this city, as the murderer of Scott. He had long and patiently listened to sectional appeals and harangues, and had even been accused of conspiring with the Roman Catholics to oppress the Protestants. He had laboured for over thirty years in the cause of religious liberty, and had succeeded in removing disabilities from Methodists and other denominations in Nova Scotia. He had sat for two years at the Government Council table, and had never seen a minister, mean, prejudiced and foolish enough to propose the decision of any question upon the ground of religious preferences. He proceeded to ridicule the idea of Ro-

Mr. Ferguson.

man Catholic domination, in face of the fact that only three of the thirteen ministers were of that faith. Ten Protestants ruled or led by so small a minority! He was sorry that Dr. Ryerson had misunderstood and condemned the conduct of the Government in relation to the appointment of a chaplain to the Red River expedition. He defended the appointments made on the ground of adequacy and appropriateness. His Protestant colleagues had decided as to the Protestant chaplain, but all denominations could not be satisfied in the matter. He believed and was certain all in the House were convinced that Sir Geo. E. Cartier was incapable of injustice towards, or of insulting any Christian minister. The non-acknowledgment of the Methodist application was a result of the official system, out of which no offence to the denomination could reasonably be construed. As to Manitoba, there was no doubt now. The elections were now taken, and they and other events had justified the course of the Government and the provisions of the Bill. What position would they have occupied to-day but for that Bill? They would have been trying to maintain a little family compact there, after the fall of the family compacts in all the other Provinces. The land was not given to the priests, but to every man, woman and child in the Province, whether French or English. In protecting the rights of the original population, the widest, most liberal provision had been made for all the population, whether volunteers, natives, or old residents. Reference had been made to Bishop Tache's influence. Why should he not have it, a man who had lived and laboured and sacrificed so much for the improvement and elevation of the population of the plains. Let the member for Lanark (Mr. Macdougall) go up there as a missionary (laughter), and he would earn popularity too, perhaps.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—I would not like to follow the hon. gentleman's example, (laughter.)

Hon. Mr. HOWE—If he had he might have avoided many of the scrapes into which he has got. (Loud laughter.) He believed the House would approve the conduct of the Government, and that neither Protestantism nor the Dominion had anything to fear from the Manitoba bill.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT expressed his conviction that the Minister of Militia was not open to blame for the omission that had appeared in the matter of this chaplaincy. Through some mistake or accident the application had been overlooked; he was satisfied not intentionally, knowing the importance and claims of this denomina-

tion he took an early opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Militia to this default. Aware of the liberality and fairness of dealing towards those of a different faith, always displayed by the Minister of Militia, he was perfectly certain the charge made against him must have arisen from some misapprehension. He (Sir A. T. Galt) was sure no slight was intended, and had desired an early opportunity of dispelling the wrong impression created.

Mr. GIBBS expressed his conviction as to the innocence of the Minister of Militia of all design to insult or overlook the Methodists in this chaplaincy affair. He was glad the present discussion arose, so as to relieve the minds of the public of all unpleasant suspicions on this subject.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS followed in the same strain, coinciding with the preceding speakers as to Sir Geo. Cartier's liberality of disposition, and repugnance to anything like prejudice or ill-will towards any denomination.

Mr. POPE deprecated the dragging in of questions of creeds, religions or sections like the present. He thought they should drop such subjects (hear, hear). He paid a compliment to the character of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. MACKENZIE justified the consideration of this religious question, which afforded a public functionary an opportunity of justifying himself in regard to a charge preferred against him in the ministerial convention of one of the largest and most influential denominations of the country. The Methodists did not complain of the Government not sending up a Chaplain, but of the refusal to allow them to despatch one at their own expense. They claimed to have the largest number of men in the battalion, and were entitled to the privilege solicited. He thought the request could have been obtained, had the Minister of Militia used his influence with the Commander in Chief.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said his answer to those remarks was just this,—the authority of the Canadian Government touching the battalion of Volunteers ceased the moment it was fully organized, since it passed under the authority of the General and Colonel Wolseley; and the military chiefs were not only opposed to the presence of two Chaplains, but to any Chaplains at all with the military (hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. MAGILL said it was the duty of the House to take hold of every subject and legislate on it, and thought it was well it should go abroad to the country, that there was no insult offered to so large and in-

fluent a body as the Wesleyan Methodists of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved for Report of Engineer of Department of Public Works, on application to erect Railway Bridge across Lachine Canal on the line of Wellington street. He said there was a considerable amount of feeling existing on the subject, and there had been a favourable report made by the Engineer on the work. He thought the production of the report would tend to a considerable extent to allay the feelings existing with respect to it.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the report would be produced in a few days.

The House then adjourned.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, Feb. 28, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

BRITISH COPYRIGHTS.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked permission to make the motion of which he had given notice some days previously, namely: For an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence relating to the question of "Copyright," as well as to that of "Reprinting British Copyright Works in Canada," which has taken place between the Imperial and Dominion Governments since the 17th February, 1870. It would not be necessary to remind those hon. gentlemen who had long been members of the Senate of the history of the question in that House, but as many had only recently taken their seats he would, for their information, make a brief statement of the facts connected with it, which, he thought, would justify him in again calling attention to a subject which he looked upon as so important as to excuse him from any appearance of undue persistence in recurring to it and would satisfy hon. gentlemen that his motion was not inopportune at the present time. In the session of 1868, a resolution was passed by the House for an humble address to be presented to His Excellency praying "that His Excellency would be pleased to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the provisions of the Imperial Act, 9th and 10th Vic., chap. 95, by which power is given to Her Majesty to approve of any Act, passed by the Legislature of any British possession, admitting into such

possession foreign reprints of British Copyright works, provided that reasonable protection to the authors, is, in Her Majesty's opinion, thereby secured to them." The Act of 1849, there mentioned, was passed on account of representations from the late Province of Canada and admitted British Copyright works reprinted in the United States at a low rate of duty into Canada. At that time the printing industry of Canada was much less advanced than at present, and we were not able to compete with the American publishers. At the same time it was felt that the country required cheap literature and that our people could not afford to pay the high price demanded for British works imported directly. Hence the concession asked by Canada was granted by the Imperial Parliament and was considered a great boon, and reprints of British works were permitted to be imported on the payment of a low rate of duty which was put into a fund for the benefit of the British author. So the case stood when the resolution of 1868 was introduced—the second part of that resolution went on to urge the necessity of "impressing upon Her Majesty's Government the justice and expediency of extending the privileges granted by the above cited Act, so that whenever reasonable provision and protection shall, in Her Majesty's opinion, be secured to the authors, Colonial reprints of British Copyright works shall be placed on the same footing as foreign reprints in Canada, by which means British authors will be more effectually protected in their rights, and a material benefit will be conferred on the printing industry of this Dominion." Between 1849 and 1868 a great change had taken place with respect to our printing industry, which was by that time in a position to compete with the same branch of enterprise in the United States in the production of cheap literature. Our progress in that particular industry forced upon us the anomaly of a foreign country being permitted to supply us with a class of literature which we could produce more cheaply ourselves, and with greater advantage to the British author whose works were so unjustifiably pirated in the United States. In this connection he could not refrain from directing the attention of honourable members to a recent publication—the Dominion Directory—which exhibited a vast amount of research and labour, and a liberal expenditure of capital in getting it up. That work was in itself an admirable illustration of the progress made by the printing industry of the Dominion up to the present time. To return to the foregoing resolutions of 1868, the Government of Canada at once acted upon them and a large amount of correspondence took place

between our own and the Imperial Government on the subject. In the session of 1869, a resolution passed the Senate for copies of the correspondence which arose out of these resolutions of 1868, and that correspondence was accordingly brought down by the Government. That correspondence continued to be carried on during the year 1869 and the early part of 1870, and on the 16th March, 1870, another motion was carried in the Senate for copies of "all correspondence since the 30th March, 1869, between the Imperial and Dominion Governments as well as between the latter and any person or persons on the subject of legalizing, under certain conditions, the reprint of British Copyright works in the Dominion." From the correspondence which was thus brought down by the Dominion Government, it appeared that the British Government promised in 1869 to remove a disability which operated unfairly on Colonial interests, and to take steps during the next session of Parliament to amend the Imperial law so that a Copyright taken out in Canada would secure to the author a Copyright throughout the British Empire. That would have been a practical benefit, but unfortunately through neglect somewhere no legislation to that effect took place. In other parts of the correspondence the views originally adopted in the first resolutions passed in the Senate were strongly advocated, namely: that we should be placed on the same footing as the Americans, with respect to the republication of British Copyrights. In that correspondence Sir John Rose, then Finance Minister, took a leading part, and strongly urged the views of the Senate, and as a proof of the reasonable spirit in which the concession was asked for from the Imperial Government he read the following sentence, showing that Canada was willing to forego any advantage from the permission to give her the reprinting of Copyrights as soon as the Americans no longer enjoyed that privilege, and an International Treaty could be arranged:

"Having considered the arguments advanced against the modification of the Copyright Law asked for in the Address of the Senate, the undersigned would recommend that the attention of the Imperial Authorities be once more invited to the subject, and that they be earnestly requested to accede to the application of the Senate, upon the understanding, if thought proper, that the change in the law, if made, should be temporary, to be determined upon the conclusion of any International Copyright Treaty between England and the United States."

Whilst that correspondence was being carried on with every appearance that the

Hon. Mr. Ryan.

Imperial Government would grant us what we desired, an occurrence took place which delayed the realisation of our hopes. A despatch was sent from Washington by the British Ambassador, with the outline of a Treaty respecting copyrights which he said, the American Government would be willing to sign. The project was laid before the Imperial Government and was approved of. The United States Government, however, with their customary caprice, declined to ratify the treaty which they had previously led the British Ambassador to suppose they would agree to. The whole question was therefore thrown back into the position in which we found it in 1868. He thought that it was now an opportune time to press on the British Government the necessity of dealing with the question. The moment the Americans saw that we could publish British Copyright works at so low a rate, as to enable us to send them across the border and compete with their own publishers, they would be more likely to enter into an International Treaty. Irrespective altogether of the reprinting British Copyrights it was only fair that Colonial Copyrights should have the right to extend over the whole British Empire. In conclusion, he stated that he had reason to believe that some correspondence had lately taken place, and he felt it was only due to an industry so closely connected with the national and intellectual development of the country, that its interests should be carefully protected.

Two objects were sought to be obtained; first, to be put on the same footing as printers of the United States in regard to reprinting British Copyright works; secondly, to induce the Imperial Government to make Colonial Copyrights extend over the whole British Empire. The latter point the Imperial Government had already agreed to concede, and it was now for the Dominion Government to urge upon the former the requisite legislation. He most earnestly called upon the Government to take immediate action, so that legislation might not be delayed beyond the present session of the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government had no objection to the resolution. The hon. gentleman had stated very correctly the different steps in the progress of the matter. The British Government assented to the address passed by the House, but nothing was done in consequence of the hope that was entertained that a treaty would be entered into between the United States and Great Britain. It was true

we had been promised legislation on the subject. Latterly, the Minister of Finance, had been following the subject up, but he (Mr. C.) did not know how far the matter had gone. The course adopted by his hon. friend (Mr. Ryan) was deserving of every praise, and he had little doubt that it would be eventually crowned with success.

The motion then passed.

THE LIBRARY.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated that when the Senate was pleased last winter to grant an allowance to the Librarian of Parliament, hon. gentlemen expressed some dissatisfaction with that mode of paying the officer in question. The same view had been taken elsewhere and it was now proposed to adopt the course, stated in the motion he now made:—

That the Committee on the Library be instructed to enquire into the remuneration, classification and duties of the Librarian and other officers and servants employed in the Library of Parliament, with a view to a rearrangement of that service.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN asked if it was not possible we might, by changing the present system, return to the very unsatisfactory condition of things, by which the Librarian considered himself only an officer of one branch, not bound to give information to members of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the intention was to guard against any such contingency, and to make the officers and servants of the Library the officers and servants of Parliament, not of one branch but of both.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that the object of the motion was to prevent what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sanborn) feared.

THE FISHERIES.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL introduced a Bill further to amend the Act with respect to fishing by foreign vessels.

The Bill was read a first time, and the second reading ordered for Friday.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL laid on the table certain papers in reference to the admission of British Columbia into the Union.

PETITIONS.

Several petitions were presented by Hon. Messrs. Panet, Macfarlane, Wilmot, and Tessier.

The House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, Feb. 28th, 1871.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the Library Committee be instructed to inquire into the remuneration, classification, etc., of the officers of the library.—

Carried.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. PEARSON—the member elected by the constituency of Colchester to fill the place rendered vacant by the appointment of Hon. Mr. Archibald to the Lieutenant Governorship of the North West, was introduced by Messrs. Carmichael and Killam and took his seat.

THE ELECTION LAW.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER introduced a Bill to make temporary provision for the election of members for the House of Commons (hear, hear from the Opposition). He expected that his hon. friends opposite would say “hear, hear” at the very mention of the measure. He would explain that since we were about to have another Province comprised in this Dominion, it was obvious that the Government could not yet enact a law to affect all the Provinces of the Dominion, as far as the representation of this House was concerned. The circumstances of Manitoba having been recently admitted into the Union and British Columbia being on the eve of joining the Confederation, had led the Government to the conclusion that it would be better to carry on the next election for the Dominion under the laws as they now prevail in the several Provinces (hear, hear from the Opposition). He might state that the Bill too, contained a provision with regard to the number of days on which elections were to take place. This Bill provided that the elections should take place on one day (hear, hear).

Mr. MACKENZIE—All on the same day?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Oh, no! (Laughter.) With regard to the Province of Ontario, the laws had been altered by the Local Legislature of that Province, and consequently this Bill provided that the voters' list in Ontario should be the list on which the elections for the House of Commons would be held during the next two years. Then, with regard to British Columbia and Manitoba, as far as the latter was concerned, the Manitoba Act provided for the election of representatives, and, until a general election law should be framed, would continue as it was. In British Columbia the elections would be held under the same law as now existed there. These were the principal features

of the Bill. The remainder of the law as it stood, with the exception of the alterations referred to, would continue in force. It was also enacted that the polling places should be provided wherever 200 votes were to be polled.

In reply to Mr. Ross, of Nova Scotia,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the law as it existed in 1867 would prevail.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had congratulated the Government on Monday on having adopted the view of the Opposition on the Independence of Parliament Act. To-day he had to repeat the process, as the Government had at last been compelled by public opinion, and what they knew to be the opinion of the House, to alter the election law. The Minister of Militia had remarked that it would be inadvisable to pass a general election law at present, in view of the fact that the number of Provinces in the Dominion was to be increased. Was the House to understand that last year Confederation was supposed to have been completed; that there were no new Provinces to be erected in the North West, that British Columbia and the two Provinces to the East were not expected to be brought into the Dominion? Was the House to understand that their views as to the prospects of Confederation were so changed on the subject that they found it necessary to adopt a new policy? That would not do for an excuse. It was very evident that the hon. gentleman had taken as much as he had taken of the policy of the Opposition, simply because he knew it would be impossible to carry an election measure without it. But the Bill would be unequal in its working as it was. It was utterly impossible, in Ontario, for instance, to take the law which was in existence when Confederation was passed, because there was no special law for that Province from which to compose an electoral list, but he went back to the laws existing in Nova Scotia in 1867, for so much of the law as satisfied his purpose in this Bill. While in Ontario the Legislature adopted by a unanimous vote the electoral law now in force there, which not only confined the polling to one day, but, to the same day throughout the Province, in Nova Scotia the Bill would allow an election to take place in one constituency on a certain day, and in another three weeks later. Of course the object of the Hon. Minister was apparent in this, but it was unfair to introduce as an election Bill, a mongrel Act like this which enacted neither one thing nor another; a law which would not have the same effect in all the Provinces. The only law which this House should adopt was the old electoral law in each Province, and let the elec-

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

tion law to be adopted be the same for the Local Legislatures as for the General Parliament. This would free the measure from the complications with which it abounded in its present shape. But, after all, he was glad that the Government had adopted the policy of the Opposition to a certain extent, and he hoped that they would be forced to adopt the balance of it and produce a measure complete in all its details, (hear, hear).

Mr. BLAKE said that after two permanent Electoral Bills had been passed, the House was now asked to enact a temporary one. Last session one had been passed, the session before the House had passed one, and now they were asked to deal with another one. The hon. gentleman had explained that the reason why he now submitted this temporary measure, was because of the introduction of the new Provinces into the Confederation. At what period since the 1st July, 1867, was not the House favoured with the news that new Provinces were to be added? Every day they were told they were coming in, though they didn't come.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Yes! yes!

Mr. BLAKE—And yet the Hon. Minister of Militia had asserted, that it was in view of these additions to the Dominion that this temporary Act was provided. Last session the Opposition had pointed out the effect that the new measure then submitted would have in the East and in the West. They had shown that it would be impossible to work it in Manitoba, and that difficulties would arise in other Provinces too. But they were told that their arguments were fallacious, and that the Union would overcome all the difficulties which were then deprecated. He was glad to hear that, taught by experience, they had admitted the truth of the arguments then advanced by the Opposition, that it was necessary to respect the views of the different Provinces on the subject, and by degrees as they became more acquainted with the franchise laws of other countries, the Government had made some approach towards providing for a common franchise to the Dominion. He was not surprised that it was merely a temporary Act. It would be coming down too far to propose a permanent Act what they opposed so persistently before, but, he had no doubt it would contain for some years to come the principle at the base of our Parliamentary representation, founded on the action of the hon. member for Hochelaga, that the franchise should be for the Dominion the same as by law established for each of the Provinces. (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said he did not intend to discuss the measure at this moment, but he felt it to be his duty to answer some of the observations made by the hon. gentleman opposite. The Manitoba measure was submitted to the House as the result of the negotiations carried on between the Dominion of Canada and the gentlemen sent as delegates from Manitoba. No one knew at the close of last session that Manitoba would certainly be a member of the Confederation. There was no necessity or intention at the outset that Manitoba should form a Province and be comprised in the Confederation. It was intended that it should be a Crown colony, and that very reason induced the Government at that time to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE—Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Then with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton, he would say that the Bill was proposed last year as there was no hope that we should have British Columbia so soon. Every one expected, of course, that sooner or later that colony would be comprised as one of the sister colonies in the Dominion. It would be useless at the close of this Parliament, with one Province just admitted and another shortly to be admitted into the Confederation, to endeavour to assimilate the laws. They could not make a law now which would apply to British Columbia. He hoped his hon. friend would take with a better feeling the good intention of the Government in adopting this course.

The Bill was read a first time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

A message from His Excellency, accompanying papers relative to the proposed union of British Columbia with Canada, was read.

THE REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

The SPEAKER read the following reply of his Excellency the Governor General to the recent congratulatory address of the House of Commons:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Commons.

I beg you to accept my sincere thanks for the address of congratulation with which you have honoured me on the occasion of my elevation to the Peerage.

The expression of your acquiescence in the favourable view which our Sovereign has graciously deigned to take of my services is highly to be valued, as conveying the good opinion of the freely chosen representatives of a people possessing the

precious endowments of energetic industry, self-reliance, and firm and orderly attachment to the freedom and institutions of their country.

The North West Territories, already added to the Confederation, and the willing accession of British Columbia, which, it is to be hoped, will shortly take effect, as they extend your bounds, so they proportionately augment the cares and responsibilities of those who are in the high places of the land; but the legislation and people of the Dominion will, I feel persuaded, prove equal to the lofty task, the vast and varied interests throughout the wide domain will be safe in their charge, and gradually cemented into one compact and contented whole, by the same wise legislation, and the same equal administration of affairs as have done so much in the past to establish the well being and satisfy the just expectations of the people. In conclusion, I return your good wishes with all sincerity, and assure you I shall retain and cherish to the close of my life a warm interest in all that regards the position and prospects of this great and growing country.

LISGAR.

Government House,
Feb. 27, 1871.

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA CORRESPONDENCE.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the papers just submitted to the House be printed without delay. He explained that the Hon. Mr. Trutch, the delegate from British Columbia, was now in Chicago, on his way to Ottawa, and would reach here, he expected, on Saturday. It was necessary, therefore, that the House should be in possession of the correspondence relative to the admission of the sister colony into the Union.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) complained of delays in printing public documents in the French language. He knew that it took some time to translate papers, but then, if there were not translators enough to do the work, more should be employed.

After a short discussion on the subject the motion was carried.

EXPENSE OF FENIAN INVASION.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House should on Friday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions affirming the expediency of indemnifying the Government for having authorized the issue of a special warrant for \$200,000, to provide for the defence of the Dominion in repelling the Fenian invasion in the month of May last.

Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought that on a motion of this kind it was necessary that a special message should be brought down concerning it, as under the Audit Act it was provided that every such disbursement should be attended by that ceremony. An appropriation of money had taken place without the authority of Parliament, and indemnity must be sought by a special message from the Throne. He thought that was both the practice and the law of the matter.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS then moved that the motion should be allowed to stand over—Carried.

SUPPLY.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved concurrence in the report of the Committee of the Whole on the motion that a Supply be granted to Her Majesty—Carried.

He then moved that on Friday next the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether it was the purpose of the Finance Minister to go into that Committee on Friday, and whether the Estimates would then be ready.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS thought it would scarcely be possible to do so.

Motion carried.

CENSUS ACT.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act to amend the Census Act."

Mr. MACKENZIE said he would avail himself of the opportunity to ask the hon. gentleman when he proposed to give some explanation to the House on this question. There were several Head Commissioners whatever they might be called, many District Commissioners, and nothing at all was known as to their salaries, or other expenses connected with the matter. The House had generously given the hon. gentleman permission to make full arrangements, under his promise that he would be much more economical in his distribution of the public monies than the former Government had been in 1861. That might be the case, and no doubt the hon. gentleman had done what he could, but considering the great license given, he thought it was due to the House that some information should be given as to the steps taken to carry out the necessary arrangements.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the Census Act required that within fifteen days of the

opening of the Session a report should be laid before both Houses. That period would expire on the morrow, when the report would be laid before the House, accompanied by all documents, and he thought his hon. friend from Lambton would then be fully satisfied with what had been done.

The Bill was then read a second time.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved that the House should, on Friday, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill. Carried.

INLAND REVENUE RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS laid on the table of the House the Official Returns and statistics of the Inland Revenue Department.

ARBITRATION.

The House then proceeded to the further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Blake for an address for copies of all correspondence between the Canadian and Quebec Governments, and the Canadian and Ontario Governments, touching the Provincial Arbitration and award, &c., of the motion of Mr. Godin in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Fournier in amendment to the said amendment.

Mr. FOURNIER addressed the House in French on the subject of his amendment, referring to the course taken; and the remarks made by the Hon. the Premier of Quebec, in the previous debate, and concluded by expressing his willingness to withdraw his amendment, it having served the purpose he had in view—that of an expression of opinion on the subject.

Hon. Mr. CHAUCHEAU also spoke briefly in French in reply to Mr. Fournier.

Hon. Col. GRAY did not rise to discuss the motion before the House, but express, his sincere hope, as one of the arbitrators that the papers would be brought before the House, and that there would be a full and fair discussion of everything connected with the matter. He did not say that that House was the proper tribunal to determine the validity of the award, indeed he was rather of opinion that it was not. He trusted that if after a full discussion of the subject the House should come to the conclusion that the course of the Arbitrators had been injudicious, or would be injurious to the welfare of the Dominion, some means would be found to obviate the difficulty. Speaking on behalf of the Arbitrators, he wished to say that they courted the most public enquiry, and whenever the matter should be discussed before that House he should en-

deavour to explain the course pursued, without feeling without prejudice, and then if the House, expressing the opinion of the public of the whole Dominion should consider that it would be better that the discussion should be reconsidered, no doubt such could be done. As to the course pursued by the Arbitrators, after the resignation of the gentleman appointed by the Government of Quebec, in continuing the consideration of the matter and arriving at the award, they had done so because they believed they had no power to abandon the duties imposed on them, and he sincerely hoped that the matter would result in peace and harmony and the restoration of good will.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought his friend from Bellechasse had adopted a most judicious course in offering to withdraw his amendment, after having elicited the discussion which had taken place, and after eliciting the declaration made on a previous occasion by the Minister of Militia, which declaration had unquestionably been elicited by the amendment. He had, however, a word or two to say to the gentlemen from the Province of Quebec, and especially to the members of the Government of that Province who had denounced the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse in such severe terms on the occasion of his first address to that House. He thought that they, at least, were not in a position to denounce that hon. gentleman for seeking the decision of the House in the same way that they themselves had taken in the Legislature of Quebec. What were the words used in the reply of the Legislative Council to the speech of the Lieutenant Governor, moved by the hon. member for Quebec County, who had so severely attacked the member for Bellechasse a few days before. They had thanked His Excellency for informing them that in consequence of irreconcilable differences between the arbitrators the gentleman appointed by Quebec had resigned his office, and then thanking him for protesting against the illegality of the proceedings subsequent to the resignation of one of the Arbitrators, and afterwards against the unjust and illegal award arrived at by the remaining two Arbitrators. Thus, they had begun by declaring that proceedings were manifestly unjust and illegal before the papers were submitted to the House, and the hon. member for Bellechasse was doing no more than had been done in the Quebec Legislature. At the present moment, the members had all the papers in their desks, and therefore the member for Bellechasse had asked the House to do no more, when in point of fact it was in possession of the papers, than the Premier

of Quebec had asked his Assembly to do when it had no papers.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE would not have considered it necessary to take any part in the discussion, had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Chateauguay. That hon. gentleman had spoken as if a personal attack had been made on the hon. member from Beauce, whereas he was quite sure that nothing of the sort had been done—at least as far as he was concerned, he certainly had intended nothing of the kind, nor did he think he had been so understood. The case which had come up in the Quebec Assembly was entirely different from that now before the House. The Quebec Legislature had been informed in the speech, that the Lieutenant Governor had protested against the proceedings which had taken place after the resignation of the Arbitrator appointed by Quebec, and they thanked His Excellency for having done so. It was quite manifest that the Legislature of Quebec was called upon to pronounce in some way as to the legality of the award, they had to take action one way or the other, and it was quite proper that they should pronounce upon it as soon as possible, and in response therefore to the Lieutenant Governor, who informed them that he had come to the conclusion that the award was illegal and unjust, they concurred in that conclusion, and thanked him for the proceedings he had adopted. The members of the Legislature had watched the matter from first to last, and were thoroughly well acquainted with it, and were therefore in a position enabling them to pronounce on the matter, but that House was not in such a position. There were many gentlemen in the House who had not taken the same interest in the matter as those directly concerned, and they could not therefore be expected to be able to discuss the matter in the absence of the papers. That therefore was reason why the House should not then discuss the matter apart from the question as to whether it was competent for the House to deal with it at all. The hon. gentleman from Chateauguay knew perfectly well that the Quebec House had not discussed the question in its details. The response to the speech of the Lieutenant Governor was merely an expression of confidence in the action which the Government had thought fit to take.

Hon. A. J. SMITH (Westmoreland N.B.) thought the subject was not one which could then be properly discussed by the House, but that it was one simply of law. He thought however, that the matter might be discussed after the production of the papers, but that the only thing that could

then be done, would be to state the facts and refer the matter to a committee of the Privy Council, but beyond that they could not go. It seemed to him that the present discussion would be only productive of harm, and it would certainly not tend to allay any feeling that might exist between Ontario and Quebec, and, he therefore, thought it unwise to discuss the question at all. He thought the legality of the award could only be tested by the proper tribunal, which was certainly not that House. Referring to the Act bearing on the matter it seemed to him that the Schedules were to be considered the joint property of Ontario and Quebec, and, therefore, the arbitrators had no right to make a distinction in the matter, as it could not be disputed that if a grant was made to two parties, that were joint owners of the property so granted, and it was provided that the assets belonged to the two Provinces conjointly, and, therefore, he thought the duty of the arbitrators was to divide the assets equally, and if a larger portion had been given to Ontario than to Quebec, he thought it was a direct contravention of the law, and he also thought that it was legally necessary that any proper award should be unanimous from the three arbitrators.

Mr. BLAKE quite agreed with the member for Westmoreland, that the House had no power to decide the validity of the award, and had therefore no right to discuss it and he did not, therefore, propose to follow the example of his hon. friend, who, after making that statement, had proceeded to a full discussion of the matter. He would venture to make a suggestion however, as to the limit of the power and the duty of the House in reference to the matter, and as to what course should be adopted in the altered circumstances under which the matter then stood before the House. The Government of Canada having the right to retain out of the subsidy of the Provinces the interest on the excess of the debt, and having also control over divers of the assets to be affected by the Arbitration, had been, as it were, bound to take some action, and acting on a conventional view of the possible or probable rights of the parties for the last three years, the Government of Canada would be called upon to determine whether it would adhere to that conventional mode of dealing with the matter or in what way it would alter it, and also what it would do in respect of the action of the Government of Quebec in the matter. There could, therefore, be no doubt that the Parliament of Canada had a right to express its opinion, a right to negative, a right to approve, and a right to censure

Hon. Mr. Holton.

any action of the Government, and that being the case, it would be perfectly legitimate to make a number of motions on the subject. No allusion had been made to the award in the Speech from the Throne, and there had been no reference to any decision on the part of the Government when his motion had been brought on, on the contrary the first minister had stated that they would do nothing at all to indicate their position in reference to the award. That state of things necessitated action on the part of the House, because if that state of things had continued the Government would have been neglecting a duty. An announcement had, however, been made from the Treasury Benches, that on the morrow a message would come down, stating the views of the Government on the subject, and he therefore suggested that the hon. member for Bellechasse should, as he proposed, withdraw his amendment, and that the debate should be adjourned until after the message, so announced, had been brought down. He was loath to enter on any discussion that might result in any ill-feeling between the two Provinces, and it was possible that the message of the morrow would remove all reason for discussion, simply leaving them to pronounce on the expediency of the course proposed by the Government.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said that he thought it very desirable that the debate should be adjourned until after the production of the papers, but there was one view of the case which had not yet been presented, and which he thought the House ought to hear. He quite agreed with the member for West Durham that the House was not competent to decide on the legality of the award, and in point of fact steps had been taken which would remove the question entirely from the arena of that House and place it before the judicial authorities. The Government of Quebec had actually taken the initiative in obtaining the judgment of the Judicial Courts, and matters were now in such a position as would result most probably in a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE—No, no.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON—The hon. gentleman might say "No, no," but he certainly knew that proceedings had been taken in the matter, that it was now before the Court of Appeal, and if he understood anything of the law of Lower Canada, there would in all probability be a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That reference might be made in various ways, but he did not pretend to know the peculiar

mode of procedure under the law of Lower Canada. He did not know when the Court of Appeal would pronounce on the question, but he was advised by gentlemen most competent to speak on the subject, that the initiatory steps had already been taken to bring the matter before the last Judicial resort that could be appealed to. He thought the House ought to be in possession of the full circumstances of the case, and should know whether the Quebec Government had taken the steps he had mentioned. He was quite sure that every one concerned for the interests of Ontario and Quebec would desire that no dispute should arise out of the mere settlement of debts, and he trusted some means would be devised to obviate every difficulty, but he thought the House would determine that it was not the tribunal finally to settle the matter, and however the matter might come up, if it should have to be determined on its strict legal merits, it would certainly have to be finally decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE simply desired to correct his hon. friend with reference to the legal proceedings which he said had been adopted. He had stated that legal proceedings had been commenced to test the legality of the award. The three arbitrators sat at the city of Montreal last summer, when the one named by the Province of Quebec resigned his position, and read his resignation at a meeting of the three. On the day following, the two remaining arbitrators continued their sittings, whereupon proceedings were taken by the Quebec Government, in the nature of a prohibition, to stay further proceedings, in consequence of the Board being incomplete, and the two arbitrators then removed to Toronto, and after some time made an award. He expressed no opinion on these proceedings, but merely desired to correct the statement of his hon. friend, who would see that the prohibition had been commenced before the award had been made. The proceedings now adopted in the Province of Quebec might result in a decision setting aside the whole proceedings, but need not necessarily have the entire effect stated by his hon. friend.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON must say that he thought his hon. friend the Solicitor General for Quebec was in error, and that he was correct in the effect he had ascribed to the proceedings taken in Quebec. There could be no doubt that the question at issue was the right of the two Arbitrators to make an award, and therefore the award could be declared invalid on the ground of the absence of one

arbitrator, so that the legality of the award was really affected.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU said that on that point the legality of the award could be tried, but there were also other grounds of dispute.

Mr. BLAKE said that of course it must be assumed that the Quebec Courts had jurisdiction in the matter.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON could not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON thought it was clear that the House should not then discuss the question, and he wished it to be understood that he had been silent, not because he agreed with what had been said, but because he did not think the House could settle the question. If the Government decided the matter, they would be placed in a very difficult position. If they upheld the award, Quebec would be against them, and if otherwise, Ontario would be against them. He considered the Privy Council should decide the question, and their decision would no doubt be received.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON enquired whether the Government would bring down the papers as well as the message on the morrow.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—the message will cover all the papers connected with it.

Mr. FOURNIER'S amendment was then withdrawn, and the debate adjourned.

CREDIT FONCIER.

Mr. DUFRESNE then moved the second reading of the Bill "An Act to facilitate the establishment of institutions of landed credit (Credit Foncier)."

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL (Lanark) thought that before the House committed itself to so important a principle as that involved in the Bill before them, they had a right to ask some explanatory statements from the gentleman who laid the matter before the House:

Mr. DUFRESNE moved the second reading of the Act to facilitate the establishment of institutions of landed credit, (credit foncier).

After some explanations the motion was carried.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked if this was the same Bill as last session, and was answered that it was.

Referred to Committee on Banking and Commerce.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT moved the second

Hon. J. H. Cameron.

reading of an Act for the better protection of navigable streams and rivers.

Mr. CURRIER hoped the second reading would not be pressed at present, as he was not prepared with certain information which he wished to use against it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT replied that if delay was simply sought to afford such an opportunity, he might wait a few days.

In response to a suggestion of Hon. Mr. Holton,

Mr. CARTWRIGHT agreed to the reference of the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, after the second reading.

Mr. CURRIER repeated his request for delay.

Mr. MACKENZIE deprecated delay at a time when the House had so little to do; besides, the subject was one of importance.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he was thoroughly in earnest about this Bill, and had given all interested time to procure evidence respecting it. He did not now see how he could let the second reading stand over.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said important information was being collected on this subject, which could not be ready for a few days. He therefore suggested the postponement of the matter till Thursday. He had no objection to the reference of the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL hoped the mover would not assent to the request for the reasons given. No information procurable could induce members to report the provisions of the Bill, to the effect that it should not be lawful for the owners of saw mills to throw sawdust and other rubbish into the streams. The principle must be assented to as to the mode of giving it effect, the penalties, and so forth. They might be questions for the Committee. The suggestion of delay seemed to be aimed against the principle of the Bill, which he hoped would be pressed.

Mr. BLAKE said the Commissioner of Public Works did not anticipate the evidence would be ready on Thursday, and he (Mr. Blake) did not think the Bill should be postponed on that account. It was eminently one fit to be read at the earliest moment, and to go before the Committee. The Bill should now be read a second time without delay.

Dr. GRANT characterised the Bill as most important. If stringent provisions, carried into effect, they would most seriously influence our local business.

Throwing sawdust into the streams did not obstruct them. The Bill would gravely retard and damage the lumbering interests in this section. Mill-owners should be allowed an opportunity of submitting the information they were now collecting on this subject in their own defence. He hoped the Bill would be left at its present stage a few days longer.

Mr. YOUNG urged that the Bill should be gone on with, and that it was wrong to say sawdust did not choke up the streams. He had been informed the bed of the Ottawa had begun to fill up from this cause in certain places. Fishery Commissioners in the West had warned certain parties and fined them for throwing sawdust into the streams. Those fines were not collected because, under the eyes of the Government, the same abuse existed. He thought the opponents of the second reading desired to kill the Bill which ought now to take that stage.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT explained that the object of the measure was to prevent the enormous nuisance now arising from the accumulation of saw dust, slabs and other rubbish in the various streams. Almost every navigable stream that flowed into Lake Ontario was in very considerable danger of being obstructed in this manner. By far the worst case, and the most important on account of the interests involved, was that of Ottawa. He believed the annual manufacture of lumber in and about this very town reached something like 100,000,000 of board measure; that represented about 10,000,000 of cubic feet, which occasioned the throwing into the Ottawa of 2,000,000 cubic feet of rubbish annually. That quantity would be sufficient to block up the river for four miles, to a width of 200 feet, and a depth of one foot. It was equivalent to 20,000 cords of rubbish yearly cast into the river. There must be some means of turning this enormous mass of fuel to some use in a cold country like ours. He was not certain the difficulty of removing it had not been exaggerated. Its removal involved expense, but not any unreasonable expense to every one now throwing it into the water. If the House ever undertook to carry out any extensive works for the improvement of the Ottawa, they would have to expend a very large sum in removing those obstacles now being flung into the channel of this stream. After the expression of sentiments from both sides of the House, which he had heard, he could not but feel it was his duty to move the second reading. The opponents of the Bill might be certain that in the hands of the Banking and Commerce Committee no unfair advantage would

be taken of them. He had the utmost desire to give fair play to the lumber interest. He desired to make the duty of preventing the casting of rubbish into the river as little onerous as possible to everyone on the Ottawa (hear, hear).

Mr. FERGUSON pointed out the danger to which country millers might be exposed by the Bill. He hoped some provision would be made to protect them in the event of its passage. Otherwise, it might be in the power of any one, from whatever motive, to give this class much annoyance.

Mr. WRIGHT regretted the Bill should have been introduced under the present circumstances. It was distinctly understood the Bill should not be introduced till next week, till those specially interested in the Bill would have a full opportunity of adducing arguments in rebuttal of the arguments in favour of the Bill. It was entirely unnecessary and would be inoperative, and to make inoperative Bills tended to bring all our legislation into contempt. To enact laws of a precisely similar character to those previously enacted appeared the height of absurdity. This was the case with the present Bill. The Minister of Marine had the same powers conferred on him by statute as were asked for under the Bill. Under these circumstances he hoped the House would not at present insist on the second reading. If this bill were passed it would be impossible for lumbermen to continue their operations. Sawdust did not injure the navigation of rivers, but he admitted slabs and scantling should not be cast into them. The experience of the last hundred years in regard to the Hudson proved that sawdust did not injure rivers. The Penobscot also was a case in point. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ANGLIN said whatever might be the experience of other rivers, he could cite the St. John as an instance of the injury rivers experienced from sawdust, slabs, and so forth. It had become necessary to pass a law to prevent the casting of this rubbish into the river and harbour. When the necessity was imposed, every one soon found a mode of disposing of this sawdust, slabs and edgings, which were now consumed by fire and other means. If the hon. member intended his Bill to prove of any value, he must increase the penalty. The Bill ought not to be summarily dealt with.

Dr. BLANCHET hoped the mover would not at present persist in the second reading. Some of his constituents were interested in it, and before the second reading he was to hear from them. He therefore hoped a little delay

would be granted (hear, hear). If private interests would be injured by the Bill, the hon. gentleman would do better to compromise the matter, and, after full information, a better opinion could be formed.

Col. GRAY confirmed the statements of the member for Gloucester with regard to the St. John. The harbour was being destroyed for navigation, and the fisheries were seriously affected by this rubbish. The sawdust was now burned to advantage. It appeared to him this noble river Ottawa was being rapidly destroyed. No doubt, the bottom of the river in the vicinity of the city was covered with slabs and other rubbish.

Mr. WRIGHT—No doubt of it.

Mr. KILLAM criticised the Bill and condemned the fourth clause. He was in favour of the principle of the Bill, but would suggest a delay till the evidence as to the effect of throwing sawdust into the rivers was collected. The matter should be referred to a Committee, to investigate the subject as regarded the whole Dominion, and deal with it in a way not to hurt any particular interest.

Mr. JONES recommended deliberate consideration in this matter and the temporary delay asked for. He gave instances of the deposit of sawdust in rivers not injuring them. The effect upon the fish was another matter. He hoped the second reading would not be pressed now.

Mr. D. MACDONALD disputed the statement as to slabs and sawdust being thrown into the St. John. He had not seen any throughout its whole course. The refuse of the St. John City saw mills was carried away and burnt. The question was one of economy so far as the saw-mills were concerned, and one as to the maintenance of the navigability of the Ottawa. He was desirous of protecting the mill owners, but they were bound to protect the navigation of the Ottawa.

Mr. BICKELL, who was imperfectly heard, cited facts to show it was the slabs and not the sawdust that settled in and injured the rivers. He would not like to vote in favour of a Bill that would embarrass valuable industry.

Mr. CURRIER urged that throwing sawdust into the Ottawa had not improved it. On the Hudson there had been more lumber made than on the Ottawa, and this work had lasted three quarters of a century, yet steamboats had no difficulty navigating it to-day. Slabs, edgings, and all kinds of rubbish were thrown into this river. As to the burning of the sawdust in the Ottawa, where water power was so much used, he thought it hardly possible to do it. It was impossible to run those

mills without first disposing of the sawdust.

It being six o'clock, the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. CURRIER resumed the debate. He said if this Bill became law he saw no way for it but to stop all the saw mills in the country. It was needless to speak of the damage this would be to the country. The fact was, the only use the rivers would be to the lumbermen would be to float away their lumber. He would say no more at the present stage of the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM said he had known sawdust to float at least 100 miles, and fill up a harbour so that it had to be dredged. He thought the House should endeavour to prevent such destruction of navigable waters. He believed the sawdust could be caught at the mills and prevented from filling up the beds of the rivers, and the question was, whether this House was going to permit the lumbermen to destroy the navigation of several rivers in order that they might save a little money for themselves. Twenty years ago, at a certain place in the Grand River, the water was 16 feet deep. In the same place it was now only 6 feet deep. It had been said that there was a Bill in existence to the same effect as the one before the House, but if that was not stringent enough in its provisions to protect the public, this one should be passed.

Mr. SHANLY thought the Bill could be better considered in Committee. The lumber interest was one of the most important in Canada, but the navigation of our streams was no less important. Those who had observed what was taking place on the Ottawa river must have seen that the navigation was being destroyed, and he thought that the conflicting interests should be thoroughly investigated by a Committee. He thought that it was absolutely necessary that there should be a law passed which could and would be enforced. Important as the lumber trade undoubtedly was, the unobstructed navigation of our rivers was paramount.

Mr. ROBITAILLE thought that if the lumber trade was of such recognised importance, it would be well to defer the second reading of the Bill until the information which was required could be obtained.

Mr. M. P. RYAN said the second reading of the Bill was for this evening, and referring it to a Committee would not interfere with the procuring of the information spoken of. He could not agree with the hon. gentleman, who argued that because saw dust sank to the bottom and

Dr. Blanchet.

raised the surface of the river that it did no damage. To his (Mr. Ryan's) mind this was one of the very worst arguments that could be used to oppose the Bill. In the spring it was well known that in many places on the shores of the Ottawa, the low banks were flooded for miles to the depth of two or three feet, and for the time such tracts of land were completely useless to their owners. There was an accumulation of sawdust in the Ottawa River which was increasing every year which would have most injurious effects on the navigation of that stream if some such measures as the one before the House were not passed. He would be glad to have the Bill referred to a Committee.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said this question was not confined solely to the River Ottawa, but affected a number of rivers and districts where the inhabitants were unaware that such a measure was before the Legislature. The House had now been sitting a fortnight, yet he had not seen this Bill reproduced in any of the newspapers. There was, therefore, no necessity for haste and it would be well to let people have an opportunity to petition this House on the subject. He was aware that a great deal of valuable information on the subject was being prepared and it might be found after all that the sawdust was not producing such very serious results. The Committee on Banking and Commerce would, no doubt, give every opportunity to the House to deal with this most important question and it would be well to refer the Bill to them.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said he was aware that there was no class of people more enterprising than the lumbermen, and he admitted that they were doing much good for the country. If he thought for a moment that the measure before the House was calculated to injure them, he would not vote for it, but, when he considered the able gentlemen who composed the committee on railway and commerce, he was satisfied that the lumbermen would be dealt with fairly and impartially by them. He admitted the difficulty of running a saw mill without dropping the saw dust into the stream. He would vote for the Bill to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. CONNELL said this was a most important measure, and one that directly affected New Brunswick. The Legislature of that Province had taken up the matter and enacted such a law as was satisfactory to the people there. If this Bill before the House was passed in its present shape its effects would be as the hon. member for York had observed, to shut

up a large number of mills in the Province. Unless it were re-modelled and made less stringent in its provisions, he hoped the Province of New Brunswick would be exempted from its operations. The Banking and Commercial Committee might understand very well the difficulties complained of in Ontario and Quebec, and he hoped they would confine their legislation to these two Provinces and leave the law which was now in existence in New Brunswick, and which satisfied the people, unaltered.

Mr. OLIVER thought if it was the intention of Parliament to expend millions of money in the improvement of our inland navigation, it would be advisable to adopt measures to prevent the obstruction of navigable channels. The time was coming when the Ottawa River would be navigated by large vessels from the upper lakes to the St. Lawrence, and care should be taken to prevent it from being choked with sawdust in the meantime. He would vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. FORTIN said it was no easy matter to get rid of the sawdust from a mill driven by water power. Several plans had been tried to prevent it from falling into the water, but all had failed. He approved of the suggestion to let the matter stand over for a while till more information could be obtained on the subject.

Mr. POPE said the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, and those who supported it, proposed to place restrictions on one of the most important interests in the country. They proposed to add considerably to the cost of manufacturing lumber and place the lumberman in a position where he could not compete with others who were more favourably situated. Rather than have this Bill passed the lumbermen should come before this House and offer to employ dredging machines at their own cost to remove the sawdust from the rivers. It would be cheaper in the end. He thought that the law as it stood at present afforded ample protection to navigable streams. He had no personal interest to serve in this matter, but he could see that there was a great interest at stake, and one that the House should be careful about sacrificing.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to Committee.

DUAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. MILLS moved the second reading of Bill No. 5, entitled: An Act to render members of the Legislative Councils, and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included or which may hereafter be included within the Dominion of Canada,

ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada.

He said that in making this motion he believed that the House had sufficient experience of the injurious results of the evils which he proposed to remedy. They had been informed that in starting this federal system of Government it was important that men of experience should be in both Houses. In Ontario it was agreed that as "birds in their little nests agreed," it would be a shame that the Local Government of Ontario and the Government of the Dominion should be in antagonism as soon as the new constitution was adopted. He thought that the excuse for adopting the principle of dual representation was no longer valid, and that the Government could now have no objection to giving this measure their support. Any one who would look at the record of this Government would see that all their theories had not been correct and that they had sometimes blundered. In the North West question and in other matters they had made mistakes, but

"While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

and even this Government while it existed as a Government would be capable of making very great progress indeed. Now, there were many considerations why this measure should be passed. On a former occasion a measure similar to this had been met with the objection that while the principle it embodied was very good, none of the evils said to flow from the system had ever actually occurred. But it was a sound principle that they should never depart from a wholesome rule because they could not always see the mischievous results likely to flow from such a departure. In the manner in which the Arbitration matter had been discussed by hon. members in the Local Governments who also held seats in this House, it might be seen that gentlemen who had official business to transact in other Governments could not bring that impartial mind to the task in this House that they should. There was the case of the unholy trinity from Ontario who held seats in this House yet their public duties required them to be elsewhere during the session. It was, therefore, quite clear that gentlemen holding seats in the Legislature, especially Cabinet Ministers, should not have seats in this House. This principle was recognized by the Legislature of New Brunswick, and to a certain extent by Ontario and Quebec, for it would be seen a comparatively small number were elected for both Houses. It was quite evident that the members of Local Governments who held seats in this Parliament were not in-

dependent. He believed not a single instance could be found—with the exception of the Treasurer of Ontario—where a member of the Local Cabinet in this House voted against the Government here. There was a species of alliance by which this Government gave its support to the Administrations of Ontario and Quebec, and they in return had supported the Government here. This was clearly a violation of the independence of Parliament, and until there was a complete separation of the Legislative functions of the Local Legislatures and those of the Parliament of Canada, they would never be enabled to fairly carry out the principle of Confederation. It was of the utmost importance that each Legislature should be composed of distinct and separate persons, and that each should in the exercise of his power especially guard the interests with which he was entrusted. It was a matter which the experience of men in every department of life fully justified, and one resulted from the imperfections of human nature, that if a man was placed in any position he would always attempt to arrogate to himself more power than was necessary for the discharge of the duties which devolve upon him. It was of the utmost importance in order that the Local and Dominion Legislatures should mutually check each other, that they should be composed of distinct persons. There were other evils growing out of this system. It was also absolutely necessary that each Legislature should have sufficient power to induce men of ability to enter into it. Here there was a proposal to constitute a Commission to unify the laws of the Provinces without consulting the Local Government, and there were no remonstrances from them against it. Now, any one who would consider the matter for a moment—would consider it a gross waste of the public funds and a gross breach of public duty to enter into such a matter without consulting the parties most interested in it. And why was there no remonstrance? Why did not the Ontario Government remonstrate with the Government of the Dominion for entering into this work of codification without consulting them? It was because they were dependent upon the Dominion Government, and their existence could be destroyed at any moment by the Minister of Justice. It was not more certain that spring would succeed winter than that the Government of Ontario would be swept out of existence before the end of March (laughter). Hon. gentleman laughed, but there was nothing more certain. Now, what would be the position of that Government if the Minister of Justice were a supporter of it?

Mr. Mills.

as the Minister of Militia was a supporter of the Government of Quebec? Was it not clear that the Lieutenant Governor would be supposed to intrigue against his own Cabinet, and in favour of those who had given him the position he held, and could take it from him at any moment. The Government had devised a system which would make the Lieutenant Governor a mere dependent on a gentleman who was antagonistic to him. They knew very well that the Lieutenant Governor would not dare to give his support to those gentlemen who were in opposition to the Minister of Militia, even though the majority of the House sustained Her Majesty's advisers. There was another consideration. This House had unfortunately been given the veto power over measures of the Local Legislature. Now he asked if a number of gentlemen holding seats in both Houses who supported the Government here and were opposing the Government of the Local Legislature would not have a strong disposition here to press the Government to abuse that veto power which they possess. These were some of the mischievous results which were certain to flow out of the present system, apart from those that had been practically developed during the past three years. They had been told on a former occasion that a measure of this kind was trenching on the choice of the people. He could not see how it applied in this case. Why declare that the judges, minors, aliens and persons not having certain property qualifications were ineligible to hold seats in this House? Why did they interfere with the choice of the people in all these matters? It was because if these things were permitted abuses would grow up out of them from party and other considerations. If the election to this "House of members of the Local Legislatures was likely to interfere with the "Independence of Parliament," or the independence of the Local Government" it was sufficient consideration for the adoption of this Bill. Certain honourable members in this House admitted that the principle of the measure was good, but, they opposed it as emanating from the Opposition. He thought that he had stated a sufficient number of considerations in favour of this measure to justify the House in its adoption, and he had no doubt that the motion for the "second reading" would be carried.

Mr. DREW opposed the motion. He did not see why the principle of compulsion should be applied in any case—why the people of Ontario and Quebec should not be allowed to send here whom they pleased. He thought the feeling of the

House was that it was for the Local Legislatures to deal with this matter. The question was in the hands of the people, whose duty it was to decide whether they would send the same person to both Houses. He moved the six months' hoist.

Mr. HARRISON said there was nothing new to be said on this subject, which had been so often discussed. He still failed to see any reason why the liberty of the people should be interfered with, or why men elected to one Legislature should not be eligible for another. There was no more reason for excluding the member of one legislature from the other, than for excluding the member of a township Council from a county Council. He saw no abstract reason against the right of the people to send the same men to both legislatures (hear, hear).

Mr. BODWELL argued that popular rights were restrained in various ways, such as the property qualification for entrance into Parliament, and allowing office-holders to sit in Parliament. He contended the example of Nova Scotia, which allowed only single representation, was deserving of imitation, and that this House had a right to deal with the question, and that now was the proper time.

Mr. F. JONES argued that the people ought to be allowed to exercise their full rights and power in regard to the elections for both Legislatures. The power of the people conveyed by the constitution should not be thus early curtailed, and in the absence of any proved necessity.

Mr. MASSON of Terrebonne contended that there was no reason for interfering with the constitution as it stood—no reason for an Ontario majority, or any majority from other Provinces, thrusting its opinions down the throats of the people of Quebec. The people should be left in possession of their present privileges till a good case for a change was made out. He deprecated hasty alterations of the constitution, and warned members against invading the rights of other provinces, or coercing their inhabitants in the manner contemplated by the proposer of this innovation (cheers).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) said it had been stated that if the people chose to elect any gentleman who had a seat in the Local Legislature to represent them in that House they ought to be allowed to do so. On the same principle, why should not the people be allowed to elect a gentleman holding position under the Government? Why should they not judge of his independence in the one case as well as in the other. The people were not allowed to elect a person in the one case, because it was thought it would do mischief. Refer-

ence had been made to the action of the Local Legislatures in the matter. They were no doubt the proper judges as to who should sit in their House, and the Dominion Parliament should also judge for itself. It had also been said that the Local Governments of Ontario and Quebec had voted down the principle, but he said that the Ontario Government had really upheld it, but our Government was compelled to do as the others did, as it could not place its people in a different position from those of other Provinces. He considered that great harm resulted from members of the Local Governments being present in the Dominion House, as he knew many instances in which they had been compelled to vote against their convictions. He also remembered reading that an hon. gentleman, now a member of the Government, had influenced twenty votes by an hours' speech, and it was well known how he himself had spoken of his influence. He concluded by reiterating his opinion as to the good effects to be derived from the passing of the Bill he had moved.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury, N.B.), made a few remarks in support of the measure.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said he had voted during the last session in favour of the Bill now before the House, and would have been prepared to give the same vote on the present occasion, if the experience of the past year had not led him to believe that it would be better to let the matter stand for the present. This change in his mind arose out of the circumstances of the Province of Quebec. The feeling in Quebec had become more fully declared in favor of the dual representation than it had been a year before. A year ago the Bill for rendering members of the Local Legislature ineligible to sit in the Dominion Parliament, had been lost by about fifteen. This year it had been lost by twenty-four. Referring to the fact that in Quebec they had two distinct races, whose representation had been protected by official enactments in the British North America Act, 1867, and as representing a portion of the minority in that Province, he thought it a great advantage to have present in the Dominion Parliament, gentlemen of French Canadian origin, who form a majority of the Government of Quebec. They naturally believed that the interests they had most at heart received a certain amount of indirect protection at the hands of that House, but he thought it useful that members of the Local Governments should have seats in that House. At the same time if he could see that the independence of the House was seriously endangered by these gentlemen being there, he confessed that the greater importance

of freeing the House from all improper influence should outweigh the local consideration. There was no doubt that there was a connection between the Dominion Government and those of the Provinces, which had arisen naturally from the circumstances attending Confederation. The Governments of Ontario and Quebec had naturally harmonised in political views with the Dominion Government, but that state of things could not be expected to continue for ever, and in time to come there might be a Conservative Government in the Provinces, with a Liberal one at Ottawa, or the reverse. It was quite clear that under these circumstances the influence of the Dominion Government over the Local would amount to nothing, but at the same time the responsibility towards the people of the country would rather be increased, as there would be a double check. He could not help noticing the reference made to Nova Scotia, and he thought it was not clear that that Province would not have been better off had its Government been represented here. For instance the preceding night a case had occurred in connection with which he had been taken to task by the hon. member for Cumberland on account of the view he had expressed, in which if a member of the Provincial Government had been present he could have explained the case fully. He thought the presence of members of Local Governments in that House was by no means open to the same objection as that of persons holding places of emolument under the Government, and if the presence of members of the Governments was not injurious, still less was that of ordinary members. Confederation was still an experiment, and as they were then on the eve of the Local elections in Ontario and Quebec, when the people could easily make their wishes known, he thought it would be unwise to alter the system. Having voted in favour of the Bill last year, and having for the reasons he had mentioned come to the conclusion that his duty required that he should now give a different vote, he had ventured to delay the House a short time to explain his reasons for the change.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL (Lanark) said his position was somewhat different from that of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken. When he sat on the other side of the House he had felt it his duty to vote against the proposition submitted by the member for Bothwell, but he was now free from every influence except that of duty to his constituents as an independent member of the House. He intended to vote as he had voted before, for the reason that as a Liberal, as a Reformer, he did not desire to restrict the free choice of

Mr. Mills.

the people, or attempt to dictate who they should or should not elect as their representatives. It seemed to him that if the people were intelligent, and they were intelligent in this Dominion, they would apply a remedy if any evil was found to result from dual election. He held that the whole theory of disqualifying and qualifying laws, and in fact of all restrictive laws, in these matters was wrong in principle, and an interference with the exercise of the franchise. It is true that the experience of the Mother Country as well as our own had justified restrictions and disqualifications in particular cases where abuses had been really found to exist. What he complained of on the part of his friend the member for Bothwell, was that he pushed his theories and philosophic views too far for the practical age and country in which he lived. He believed that in the new experiment of Confederation, it was no objection that the Governments of the Dominion and Provinces were in accord and working together harmoniously; it was rather an advantage. He feared his hon. friend had gone a little further than the expression he had used implied, that of securing the "Independence" of Parliament. It might be desirable in a party view to be able to detach the powerful influence of the different Provincial Governments from the Government of the Dominion. He, however, as one of those responsible to his constituents and the country for the new system of Government, was determined to endeavour to make the experiment a success, and until British North America was consolidated, until all the Provinces were working under the new constitution, he had no desire to add to the antagonisms and hostilities between the several Provinces arising out of the circumstances preceding the Union. When an abuse was found, when measures of public utility were delayed by reason of the presence of members of the Local Governments in that House, then he would yield to the force of that argument, but at present, having listened to the reasons given in support of the Bill, he had been unable to see during four years of most successful government that had elapsed since Confederation, any sufficient reason for adding to or modifying the constitution in that respect. He thought there was great force in the argument, that as they were on the eve of new elections, it would be better to await the expression of the opinion of the people, than to assume by any action taken now that a change was desirable. The change in the vote of the Quebec Assembly was a proof that the first view of the question, which seemed

to have carried the Local Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, had changed, and that change was a strong argument that the Dominion Parliament should hesitate before attempting to override the views of the Provinces. The question had been discussed in the Ontario Legislature, and the member for West Durham, with all his great ability and eloquence, had failed to convince that body that it was inadvisable to allow members of that House to sit in the Dominion Parliament, and he was inclined to think that in the new Assembly there would be a strong disposition to repeal the Act which prevents members of the Ontario Government from sitting in this House. A very important matter had been discussed, namely, the division of property between the two Provinces, and every one must admit the very great benefit that had been derived in that discussion, both before this House and in the Committees, from the presence of hon. gentlemen from Ontario who had given their special attention to the matter, and were able to furnish valuable information which would not otherwise have been obtained. He was therefore not prepared to support the measure of the member for Bothwell, until it could be shewn that abuses really existed which a restrictive law alone could prevent.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER would not have spoken on this occasion but for a remark made by the member for Lambton on the passage of the reply to the address from the Throne, which had now been reiterated by the member for Bothwell, as to a remark which they alleged he had made when addressing his constituents on the occasion of his recently soliciting re-election. They alleged that he had then boasted of the great influence he had over members from Nova Scotia in that House, and he thought it was due to those members to state that the expression he had used would in no way bear the construction that had been put upon it. If he had not replied to the remark of the member for Lambton when it was uttered, it was only because he did not consider it necessary, but as the matter had now been repeated he thought he ought to make some explanation.

Mr. BLAKE rose to a point of order, maintaining that as the member for Cumberland had not replied to the member for Lambton at the time, and as the member for Lambton was not in his seat, he (Hon. Dr. Tupper) had no right to bring up the matter then.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER acknowledged the call to order, and said he would simply confine

himself to the refutation of the statement as made by the member for Bothwell. In his address to his constituents he had explained that when his honourable friend the Secretary of State for the Provinces had felt it his duty to change his attitude with regard to Confederation he had been proud to become his humble follower, and when that hon. gentleman felt it to be his duty to assist to work out the great institutions which he found it impossible to oppose, he felt it his duty to assist him. He had never said anything to lead anyone to suppose he wielded any undue influence over the members from Nova Scotia. The attitude of hostility taken invariably by the leading members of the Opposition as regards Nova Scotian interests, left no option to the representatives of that province, but that of supporting the Administration. Having watched the operation of the dual representation, he thought it would ill become him to endeavour to force the views and principles of Nova Scotia members upon the unwilling members for the great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The success of Confederation had been greater in the Provinces enjoying dual representation. There had been more harmony between the Government of the Dominion and the Local Governments of the Provinces enjoying this system, than had existed as regards the other Provinces. The country gained much from having in both legislatures the same men, as respects greater harmony between the different portions and governments of the Federation. He would heartily oppose this unnecessary motion.

Mr. BLAKE said he was willing to vindicate the part of himself and the Opposition with regard to Nova Scotia. They had freely consented to all measures consistent with its full rights, but to nothing more. But they had not thought it their duty to do anything proper in an improper way. With regard to the alleged advantage of local ministers attendance in this House, there was another side to the picture. Now it was argued that the progress of Confederation was accelerated because the local Governments were represented here. Suppose they disagreed with the Federal Ministry. In that case, the cause of Confederation might be as much retarded or damaged as it was said it was now benefited.

Mr. CARMICHAEL explained that in the Nova Scotia Legislature he had opposed the Bill of Dr. Tupper, to abolish dual representation, and was quite consistent in his intention to oppose the present motion. He had no desire to de-

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

prive Ontario and Quebec of the privilege of representation in both Legislatures.

The amendment was then put to the vote with the following result. Yeas, 74: nays, 54.

YEAS—Messrs. Ault, Beaty, Bellerose, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier, Sir George E., Cartwright, Cayley, Chauveau, Cimon, Colby, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Galt, Sir Alexander T., Gaucher, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Harrison, Heath, Holmes, Howe, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Terrebonne), McCallum, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ryan (Montreal West), Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Willson, Wright (Ottawa County).—74.

NAYS—Messrs. Anglin, Barthe, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Carmichael, Cheval, Coffin, Connell, Costigan, Coupal, Delorme, Ferris, Forbes, Fortier, Fournier, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Kempf, MarFarlane, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Renfrew), McMonies, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pearson, Pelletier, Redford, Ross (Dundee), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N. B.), Ross, (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Scriver, Smith, Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wallace, Wells, Workman, Wright (York, Ontario), Young.—54.

On motion of Sir George E. Cartier the House adjourned at 10:35.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 1st, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

NEW MEMBERS.

Hon. Messrs. SMITH and READ were sworn in and took their seats as members of the Senate.

THE ARBITRATION.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that he would not move his resolutions respecting the Arbitration until the papers asked for by the hon. member for

the Gulf division were before the House. It was requisite that the House should have the information in question before any discussion took place, and should ascertain the policy of the Government.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the course to be taken by the Dominion Government would be explained by the papers brought down with the correspondence. He had now the honour of bringing down the papers in question which would be immediately printed.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that in rising to make the inquiry of which he had given notice on a previous day, he would take the opportunity of stating that the St. Peter's Canal was a work in which the Island of Cape Breton took a deep interest, and he regretted to find that there was no mention of it in the circular recently issued by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Canal system of the Dominion. A reference to a map of that valuable Island would show that it was indented by a large inland Sea, called the Bras D'Or Lake, which was separated from the ocean by a narrow isthmus a little over half a mile wide. Shortly before Confederation the Local Government of Nova Scotia, convinced of the importance of the work, commenced to open up communication between the Bras D'Or Lake and the Atlantic, and the Canal had been energetically completed, but it was found to be too narrow, and shallow for the requirements of the class of vessels which ought to make use of it. Under such circumstances, he thought that the necessity of improving that canal should have been among the matters considered by the Commission. The island of Cape Breton was divided into four counties, and had a total population equal to that of the neighbouring colony of Prince Edward Island. Its resources were very varied and not exceeded by those of any other section of the Dominion of the same area. Although a large amount of money had been expended on the canal, still it might in one sense be said to be only half completed, and in order to make it really beneficial to the people of Cape Breton, it was advisable to build another work of a similar kind, as a part of the same inland communication, from the Portage East Bay, to Spanish River which led to the coal mines of Sydney. It should be remembered that the island of Cape Breton had not a direct interest in the expenditure of the large public works which had been constructed in Nova Scotia proper before the Union of the provinces; and the expenditure on the canal had therefore been made as a partial

equivalent for the proportion of the public debt which the people of the section in question had to pay for works which did not benefit them. It would be doing the island a great injustice, were the subject not taken into consideration by the Government and the claims of its inhabitants acknowledged. For these reasons, he asked permission of the House to make the following enquiry of the Government :

Why in the circular dated 25th November, 1870, issued by the Canal Commissioners appointed by the Privy Council to obtain information on which to base a plan for the improvement of the Canal system of the Dominion, no reference is made to St. Peter's Canal, in the Island of Cape Breton: and whether it is intended to include that work in the contemplated scheme of improvements?

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT said that he could not allow the present occasion to pass without making some reference to a subject in which he felt the deepest interest. Before his hon. friend who had just spoken had a seat in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, he (Mr. B.) had advocated the construction of the canal, and it was with not a little surprise that he had noticed the omission of any reference to it in the circular of the Commissioners. Since his arrival in Ottawa he had addressed a letter to the Commissioners drawing their attention to the fact, and showing the necessity of enlarging the work. He had also stated in his letter that in order to benefit the Island of Cape Breton, it was necessary to build another canal across the portage between the Bras D'Or and Spanish or Sydney river. At present the class of vessels chiefly engaged in the coal trade could not make use of the canal, as had been contemplated in the inception of the work. If it were the proper time he could show the House that the Island of Cape Breton had never, either before or since Confederation, received that consideration which she was entitled to.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the canal in question had been commenced by the Province of Nova Scotia and completed by the Dominion to the extent which was contemplated at the outset. Why there was no mention of the work in the circular of the Commissioners he was unable to say, for the Government were not in their confidence. They had been appointed for the purpose of enquiring into improvements that should be made with a view to the interests of the Dominion. The canal was now the property of the Dominion, and he presumed that any repairs necessary would be made, but it was not in the contemplation of the Government to enlarge it in any way.

THE INMAN LINE.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that he had placed a notice in the paper of some interest to the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well. The people of those Provinces were now dependent upon fortnightly steamers for their communications with England, and for the performance of that service he believed there was an annual subsidy of £8,000 sterling. He was bound to say that much dissatisfaction was felt throughout Nova Scotia, as to the manner in which the service was performed. So irregular and long were the passages that the business community could not answer their correspondents in England with the expedition so requisite. He was instructed to say that the short railway link of Western extension would be completed during the existing year, and in that way communication had with the railway system of Canada and the United States. Therefore it was very important that any new contract should have reference to the fact that in the course of the year there would be continuous railway communication with Halifax. He hoped that his hon. friend, the Postmaster General, would consider whether a fortnightly steamer would meet the requirements of commerce, when the railway was completed. With these few prefatory remarks he would ask the Government when the contract between the Government and Messrs. Inman for carriage of mails between Halifax and Liverpool shall expire, and whether it is the intention of the Government to renew the contract?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the contract between the Government and Messrs. Inman expired on the first of July next. It was the intention of the Government to keep up the service, and circulars had been also addressed to the Messrs. Allan and Cunard asking them for tenders. It was proposed to ask for tenders up to the time of the completion of the Intercolonial Railway. No answers had yet been received.

Hon. Mr. MILLER asked if the Government could not exercise any control with respect to the manner in which the service was performed.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied there was a regular contract.

Hon. Mr. MILLER wished to know if the conditions of that contract had been complied with.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL could not say of the contrary.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT asked if the service included connection between Halifax, Sydney, and St. John.

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL answered in the negative.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked if the attention of the Government had been called to a mail service between Newfoundland, Halifax, and the West Indies. If there was a prospect of Newfoundland coming into the Confederation, it would be well to keep that service in view, in asking for tenders for any contract for a mail service across the Atlantic.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said he understood the Hon. Postmaster General to say it was intended to make the contract contingent on the completion of the whole line of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, he would suggest whether the contract should not really be made with reference to that portion of the line between Amherst and Truro. It was certainly to be hoped that portion of the road would be soon completed. It would be mostly used by travellers on their way to the United States or Montreal.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said in answer to Hon. Mr. Ryan, that the establishment of the line of steamers in question depended upon the coming of Newfoundland into the Union. The Government had had that service very much at heart, but under existing circumstances they could not embark in an undertaking of such magnitude. As respects the suggestion of his hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Botsford), he was glad that it had been made, and would endeavour to secure the arrangement proposed in any new contract that might be entered into.

GENERAL BUSINESS.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL laid on the table certain papers connected with Acts passed last session, in reference to Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD gave notice that he would enquire, on Friday next, of the Government when that portion of the Intercolonial Railway between Amherst and Truro would be ready for traffic.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS presented the annual report of the Secretary of State for Canada.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 1, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.
Some petitions were read and referred.

NEW BILLS.

Mr. SAVARY moved for leave to intro-

duce a Bill to amend section 2 of the Insolvent Act of 1869.—Carried.

Mr. BROWN moved for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise the village of Trenton to impose and collect harbour dues and for other purposes.—Carried.

REPORTS.

Hon. Mr. Dunkin presented the report of the Minister of Agriculture under the Census Act.

MESSAGES.

A message from His Excellency was submitted by Sir Geo. Cartier, containing a copy of the agreement between the Imperial and Canadian Governments relative to the Manitoba Act, with copies, in draught, of the bill presented to the Imperial Parliament on the subject. Also copies of the agreement between the Dominion Government and Governments of Ontario and Quebec, with other documents respecting the award of the arbitrators.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the Minister of Militia the other day promised to announce the action proposed to be taken by the Government on this subject.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said if the hon. gentleman looked at the papers he would discover the action of the Government with regard to the Arbitration. There was an Order in Council by His Excellency which formed part of the documents now submitted.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON suggested the reading of the Order in Council, because it was the essence of the communications.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—No objection whatever (cheers and laughter).

The Clerk then read :

An Order of Council of date 27th Feb. concurring with the following report of the Hon. Minister of Justice in reference to the Arbitration between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec :

In the matter of the arbitration under the British North America Act, 1867, between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec referred to the undersigned, he has the honour to report that under the 142nd section of the said Act the following Arbitrators were appointed, viz : The Hon. David Lewis Macpherson by the Government of Ontario, the Hon. Charles Dewey Day by the Government of Quebec, and the Hon. John Hamilton Gray, (of St. John, New Brunswick), by the Government of Canada, his appointment dating from March 21st, 1868. That by a despatch from the Lieutenant Governor of

Quebec to the Secretary of State for the Provinces, bearing date the 11th July last, an order of the Executive Council of that Province was transmitted for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General which order in Council sets forth that : Whereas the Hon. J. H. Gray has resided for more than one year, and has become a resident in the Province of Ontario, and has become thereby disqualified to act as such Arbitrator, it has become the duty of this Province to object to the said Hon. John H. Gray acting as such Arbitrator. That by a despatch of the same date, the Lieutenant Governor transmitted two letters dated 9th July, from the Hon. Charles Dewey Day addressed to the Provincial Secretary of Quebec resigning his appointment as Arbitrator under the section above cited. That by a subsequent despatch of the 19th July, the Lieutenant Governor submitted a copy of an order of his Council accepting the resignation of Mr. Day as the Arbitrator named for the Province of Quebec. That by a letter dated the 5th Sept, Messrs. Gray and Macpherson, the other two Arbitrators, transmitted a copy of the award made by them under the said Act, stating that such an award had been made in duplicate, and sent also to the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, that the award is signed only by Messrs. Gray and Macpherson, and after reciting that the three Arbitrators were appointed by the several Governments as above mentioned, proceeds to state that "the said Arbitrators having taken upon themselves the burthen of this said Arbitration, the said John Hamilton Gray and David Lewis Macpherson being a majority of the said Arbitrators, do hereby award, order, and adjudge of and upon the premises as follows, that is to say, &c., &c., &c., that by a despatch from the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, dated the 14th September, a copy of an order of the Executive Council of Quebec was transmitted, protesting for the reasons therein given against any force or validity being given to the pretended judgment or award of the said two Arbitrators by the Federal authority, and advising of the intention of the Government to appeal for redress and justice in every constitutional mode, which it is the privilege of British subjects under the Crown to exercise when suffering under injustice or wrong from the hands of any." That by a subsequent despatch, dated 22nd December last, from the Lieut. Governor he transmitted an address from the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, to His Excellency the Governor General, setting out that the Hon. J. H. Gray having taken up his residence at Ottawa, the Government of

Quebec have deemed it incumbent to protest against his continuing in office, and to express their conviction that the decision of the Arbitrators should be unanimous; that the Arbitrator appointed by the Province of Quebec resigned his office; that such resignation was accepted, and that the Government of Quebec at the same time protested against any ulterior action on the part of the Commission which was thus rendered incomplete; that Messrs. Gray and Macpherson, notwithstanding such representation, entered upon the examination of the questions submitted by the two Provinces without the Province of Quebec being in any way represented, and made their award against which the Lieut.-Governor of Quebec protested as unjust and illegal; that the injustice of the pretended award is evident from the facts stated in the address; that the pretended award is absolutely illegal, null and void, for the reason therein set forth, and as having been rendered by two Arbitrators, who, by the resignation of their colleagues, remained without power or jurisdiction: That, therefore, the intention of the "British North America Act" had not been carried out, and no title has been conferred upon either Province in relation to the credits, properties, and assets, which it was the duty of the said Arbitrators to apportion and divide between the two Provinces. That the Province of Quebec can neither submit to its property being disposed of, or to any sum whatever being exacted from it, nor can it accept any property credits or assets in virtue of the pretended award, and will resist by all the means within its power the execution of the said pretended award, claiming as it does, that justice be done, and that its rights as represented by the British North America Act be maintained, they therefore pray that His Excellency the Governor General will be pleased to adopt such measures as are best calculated to ensure justice to that Province.

The case stands thus.—

The Government of Ontario maintains the validity of the award. The Government of Quebec contends that it is altogether illegal and void, and declares its intention of appealing for redress and justice in every constitutional mode, and the Legislature of Quebec also protesting against its validity asks the Governor General to adopt measures to protect the rights of that Province. Now the Government of Canada has no power or means of interfering between the parties, or of enforcing the award as valid or setting it aside as invalid, or of granting the means of redress or the measure of protection sought for by the Legislature

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

of Quebec. It is for the Government of Ontario if it desires to enforce the award to take such steps as it may be advised that the law allows for that purpose, and it is for the Province of Quebec to take the necessary legal steps to resist any action on the part of that of Ontario. If the question of the validity of the award becomes a matter of litigation either Province will have the power of carrying it by appeal from the decision of any inferior tribunal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as the Court of last resort. If the Governments of the two Provinces were to agree in a statement or special case with the view of submitting the question of the validity of the award to the Judicial Committee, it would be the duty of His Excellency the Governor General in being prayed so to do to transmit such special case to the Secretary of State for the Colonies with a request that it should be submitted to such judicial committee for their opinion under the 4th clause of the Imperial Act, 3 and 4 William, 4th, chapter 41. If the two Governments do not agree upon a joint submission of the case it will be in the power of either Government to pray Her Majesty to refer the case as stated by it for the opinion of the judicial committee. As it is obvious that if the Governor in Council were to assume to decide the questions in dispute the Province against which such decision would be given would not accept or submit to it, and as such decision would have no legal force whatever, the undersigned recommends that no expression of opinion be given by His Excellency in Council; and for the same reasons the undersigned refrains from making any report on the legal questions under present circumstances, and until the questions raised respecting the award are settled by judicial decision the undersigned is of opinion that no action with respect to it can properly be taken by the Governor in Council.

(Signed,)

JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON reminded the Hon. Minister of Militia that he had been kind enough to volunteer any information the House might want on the subject.

Several members—*en Français!*

The papers having been read in French,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said at least one important paper relating to this subject was not included. This order in Council bore date Feb. 27. The report of the Minister of Justice on which it was founded, was dated 25th Feb. A payment to the Pro-

vinces became due in January. He assumed it was made in some form, and that the Government being in possession of the award, some decision must have been come to prior to that payment. The order upon which it was made must be an order in Council, without which the papers were not complete.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he had much pleasure in informing the hon. gentleman there was no such paper. The Government had taken no action on the award. The payments were made to the Provinces on the same footing as formerly.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—How could they have been made in the face of the award without the Government deciding to act on it or disregard it?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—That was the fact. In January the award was in possession of the Government, as also the protest from the Quebec Government. The Canadian Government thought proper irrespective of the award to make the payments as before.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—There is no record of such decision.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—The fact of the payment was as good.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS repeated this statement, adding that the old payments had to be made till an order was given to the contrary.

MOTIONS.

Mr. BROUSSEAU, on the presentation of the correspondence and papers in connection with the arbitrators award, moved their reference to the Committee on Printing—Carried.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. RENAUD—Asked whether it is the intention of the Government to make, during the present session, any change in the Tariff under which the consumers of flour in the Maritime Provinces are the principal sufferers?

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—I hope at an early day to state the intentions of the Government.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—To make a flowery statement. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. SMITH asked—Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for the uniformity of the laws relative to property and civil rights under the authority of the 94th clause of the British North America Act?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied Government did not intend to do more than

was done the other day, namely, submit to the consideration of the House the preliminary report of Col. Gray.

Hon. Mr. CONNELL asked—Whether in the account transmitted to the British Government for the expenses incurred by Canada, in consequence of Fenian raids, the expense incurred by New Brunswick for like services previous to Confederation was included.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied The Government has transmitted to the Imperial Government the claims for indemnity for any losses that may have been incurred either by the Dominion Government, any of the Provinces, or any inhabitant in any part.

Mr. THOMPSON asked whether it is the intention of the Government to re-establish the money order office at the Indiana Post Office, Province of Ontario; if so, when; if not, why not?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—The office was suspended in consequence of the inability of the Postmaster to carry on the business correctly. The Government, unhappily, were not more fortunate in the appointment of a successor, for the same difficulty arose. A new appointment had been made, and measures were now in progress to re-establish the money order office at that place.

Mr. FORTIN asked whether the government have received any communications from the Governments of Ontario or Quebec, respecting a proposed settlement of the surplus debts and assets of the late Province of Canada?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that neither the Government nor any of the members of the Government had received any communication on the subject from the Government of Ontario, but some of the members of the Dominion Government had received communications from members of the Quebec Cabinet, suggesting a mode of settling the difficulty. It was this: that the Dominion Government should assume the surplus (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Is the record of this application among the papers submitted?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—No, there is no record, it is simply a fact (hear, hear, and laughter).

Mr. CAMERON, of Huron, moved for an order of the House for a return of Insurance Companies which had made deposits required by the law enacted last year? He said that there was a great deal of doubt in the minds of policy holders, especially in the constituency he represented.

ed, as to whether they were sufficiently protected by that Act. Within the last year or so, a large number of foreign insurance companies had failed, and policy-holders were victimized. He asked for these returns because he understood that the Government proposed to introduce a measure affecting insurance companies. He hoped it would be such a one as would more effectually protect policy holders than the one now in operation. The list of companies which had complied with the Act and deposited the amounts required with the Government, he understood had been published in the *Canada Gazette*. It might as well have been published in the court journal of Madagascar, if such a journal was ever issued, as in the *Canada Gazette*. It would be much better to publish that list in some influential newspaper—the *Globe* for instance—and then the public might know which companies had complied with the requirements of the Act.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said there could be no objection to furnishing the information required. He took the opportunity of saying that, notwithstanding the very great abuse which had been heaped upon the Government for introducing and passing that Act, he had reason to believe that it gave the public substantial protection. The Government would not be turned from increasing that protection to the public, notwithstanding this abuse. Those who made a business of denouncing the administration had assailed the measure as one for increasing the funds in the Treasury (hear, hear). He was in a position to say that during the past year the Government had been embarrassed by the operations of that Act—that they did not want money, and money was sometimes paid them which they did not want and would rather not be embarrassed with. When reference was made to the Act now in operation, and complaint was made that it did not give sufficient protection, his hon. friend must remember that the Opposition assailed it when it was introduced for containing a provision which afforded that very protection.

Mr. GIBBS (Ontario) thought that if the Act was intended to be for the benefit of Canadian policy holders the funds in the hands of the Government should be held solely for their benefit.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that if the object of the Bill were to bring money into the treasury it had been exceedingly well contrived to attain that object, and his own impression was that had really been the primary object. If, on the other hand, the protection of Canadian policy holders had been the object in view, it had been most unfortunately framed.

Mr. Cameron.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS would postpone the discussion of the merits of the case until a future occasion when the Bill proposed to be submitted had been brought down. If the hon. gentleman then found that he could in any way improve what was proposed by the Government he would have full opportunity of endeavoring to do so. He admitted that there was a distinction between companies, as it had been found impossible to treat mutual companies as other companies were treated, and the point was one deserving of the greatest consideration. The deposits made by mutual companies were not entirely for the benefit of Canadian policy holders but those made by other companies were, and in a recent case in which the position of an insurance company had caused some alarm, the deposit was held entirely for the benefit and protection of Canadian insurers.

The motion was carried.

NORTH WEST.

The next motion before the House was one which had been made by Mr. Blake, that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of the admission of Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory into the Union, and the Legislation in reference to the same.

Mr. Blake said that the matter to which the motion he had made had reference, being affected by the paper which had been brought down that day he thought it would not be advisable to proceed with the matter until those papers had been printed and placed in the hands of the members, and he proposed therefore to let the matter stand over.

Motion allowed to stand.

LIQUOR INSPECTION FUND.

Mr. BOURASSA moved that on Monday next the House should go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the creation of a fund to be denominated "The Liquor Inspection Fund," &c.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said that in the interval preceding the day named, he would consider the resolutions and be prepared to state his opinion of the subject.

Motion carried.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. FOURNIER (Bellechasse) moved an address for copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and reports in connection with a survey, made with a view to the construction of a Harbour of Refuge

at Rimouski, with the estimated cost of the harbour. He then addressed the House in French on the subject, pointing out how important it was that such a harbor should be constructed, as steamers of the Allan line and others would be able to go in there all the year round, and also showing that it was absolutely necessary in the interest of the safe navigation of the St. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. **LANGÉVIN** replied in French, explaining the steps which the Government had taken in the matter.

Mr. **FORTIN** (Gaspé) said he considered the matter was one of very great importance. He had seen, with pleasure, the intention of the Government to construct a Harbour of Refuge in some part of the Lower St. Lawrence. From what the Minister of Public Works has stated, it seems that on the recommendation of the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, a survey had been made about Rimouski, and no one could doubt the great necessity for such a work when it was remembered that from the entrance into the River up to Quebec there was not a single harbour (except one on the North shore called the Seven Islands, which was altogether out of the way) where a vessel could be safely anchored. When the Intercolonial Railway should be in operation, connecting the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with the centre of Canada. Such a harbour would be especially important and he thought it was their duty to see whether they could not assist nature and find some place where the vessels could stop in safety, some 12 or 20 hours before they could reach Quebec, where they could put mails and passengers ashore and send them to the South and to the West. This harbor of refuge at Rimouski other, neighbourhood, he did not care where would not only be useful as establishing a Port on the Lower St. Lawrence, but would also be of great benefit to the Northern parts of New Brunswick, as the people of that part of the country would thereby be brought nearer, not only to Europe, but also to Ontario and Quebec. Persons or goods from Europe destined for new Brunswick could be landed at this harbor and at once transported to their destinations by means of the Intercolonial Railway at a less cost, and very much more speedily than by any other route. It was well known that it was difficult to get any of the steamers plying between New York and England to call at St. John, N. B., as although it was a fine port it was somewhat out of the way of the track of those steamers. Halifax was not so situated, and no doubt when it became the terminus of

the Intercolonial Railway steamers would call there more frequently than at present, but St. John could scarcely ever get a mail steamer to call there. The whole Northern part of New Brunswick was without a steamer, while if there were a harbour where vessels could call safely at all times of the day or night, that want would be supplied. He thought the Government could certainly not be blamed for having had an exploration to ascertain whether a Harbour of Refuge could be constructed in the neighborhood in question.

Dr. **ROBITAILLE**—The Government were right in getting a survey or exploration made of the harbour and vicinity of Rimouski, with the view of building a harbour of refuge. The want of such accommodation has been felt at all times for steamers as well as for sailing vessels; for schooners as well as for ships sailing on the gulf and river St. Lawrence. Also, there is no doubt, as the Hon. Minister of Public Works has said, that a harbour in that vicinity, in connection with the Intercolonial railway, would shorten the distance by several hours between Europe and Canada; but if the Government is in earnest on this point, they should extend the explorations further down. I am sure that when such an important subject is in question local interest will not be allowed to come into play, and that the Government well understand that the public interest will be better served by widening their sphere of information. A survey of the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs will show that that coast is free of ice, free of fog, and offers easy access to steamers for the twelve months of the year in the harbour between New Carlisle and Paspébiac points—that mails and passengers from Europe landed there in winter as well as in summer will reach, by the Intercolonial Railway, Montreal or Toronto in less time than if landed at Rimouski or Halifax. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, in his report, recommended that the harbour of Shippigan should be selected for a winter as well as a summer harbour, because it was the shortest route from Europe. At the time of this recommendation people in the vicinity knew well that Shippigan was an impossibility as a winter harbour, because it lies on the south shore of Baie des Chaleurs, and the North winds, always prevalent in winter time, keep that shore blocked with ice and inaccessible. For the same reason the South Shore of the St. Lawrence River is inaccessible in winter, while from the same cause the North Shore of Baie des Chaleurs is free from ice and quite accessible at all times. I have lived in Baie des Chaleurs for the last thirteen years, and have never

seen ice to prevent a steamer from coming to Paspébiac or New Carlisle in the coldest months of winter, and I seize this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to this fact. I commend the Hon. Minister of Public Works for the lively interest he has taken to obtain all information possible with a view to establish a Harbour of Refuge at Rimouski or its vicinity, and I am very anxious to enlist his solicitude for Baie Chaleurs, considering that it offers a harbour accessible at all seasons. Therefore, I trust that, keeping in view the general interests of the Dominion, the Government will order the necessary exploration and survey of the Harbour of Paspébiac and New Carlisle as soon as possible.

Mr. WORKMAN, of Montreal, while admitting the importance of the subject, and hoping it would have all the consideration it deserved, trusted that the Government would not expend a large amount of money merely to increase the value of the property of individuals, which was certainly supposed to be the case in the matter under discussion. Nothing but a very heavy expenditure would result in constructing a Harbour at Rimouski, as there was no depth of water, and it would be most absurd to attempt to construct a Harbour there at all. He hoped that before any expenditure was incurred, a reliable survey would be made, and full particulars obtained, and that favour would have no weight in the selection of the locality.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL (North Lanark), said that he always listened with some apprehension, when he found the Hon. Minister of Public Works, and the members for Gaspé and Bonaventure agreeing on projects for improvements in the part of the country in question.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that he had already explained the matter fully to the House in French, but as the hon. gentleman, the member for Lanark, might not have fully understood him, he would be glad to repeat his statement in English, although he might not speak so clearly in a language which was not his own. In replying to the hon. member for Bellechasse, he had told him he was mistaken in supposing that the Government had undertaken the survey for the purpose of making a Harbour of Refuge at Rimouski, a harbour which could receive vessels during the winter. That was not the intention of the Government. A survey had been undertaken on a report of the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway that that railway approached the St. Lawrence at Rimouski for the last time before taking its course into the interior of New Bruns-

wick. Another reason for selecting Rimouski was that Father Point, the point where steamers between Quebec and Europe received or landed their pilots, was only a few miles further down. A survey had, therefore, been ordered, the engineers had worked during the summer and had returned a short time ago, and were then preparing their plans, and a report would be made to the Department in due time. The object, however, was not to make a Port of Refuge, but to provide a place where vessels could discharge their cargoes at the railway and receive cargoes from the railway, and where the European steamers could land their passengers, baggage, and mails, so that a train could be in readiness for the East and West, by which means they could reach Quebec twelve hours, Montreal eighteen or twenty hours, and Toronto many hours earlier than they would if the steamers had to go to Quebec, and so that steamers would not be delayed by fog as they were now. That was a very important object, and the Government had thought it right to order a survey. As to the amount which the hon. member for Bellechasse had spoken of it was out of the question. He (Hon. Mr. Langevin) had spoken to one of the Engineers on the subject, who had told him that no estimate had been made, but that that sum was out of all proportion. The hon. member for Bonaventure had raised another question in suggesting the Baie de Chaleurs as a landing place which would be available in winter. The survey that had been made had not been for the purpose of finding a Winter Harbour. That was another question altogether, and the hon. gentleman must see that a harbour in the Baie de Chaleurs would not prevent mariners from navigating the St. Lawrence as they did now, and therefore a harbour at Rimouski would still be necessary. If it could be shown to the Government that at any particular place a harbour could be constructed which would be available all the year round, the Government would then consider the matter and decide whether a survey should be made, but that should not interfere with the Rimouski survey, as the objects were entirely different.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL (Lanark), in resuming, said the explanation the hon. gentleman had made was so far satisfactory, in that it showed that nothing had as yet been done beyond the making of an investigation as to the practicability of the construction of the Harbour at the place mentioned. The construction of a Harbour of Refuge involved a very large expenditure, and certainly no complaints or demands had ever been heard from the people in the neighbourhood concerned

Dr. Robitaille.

as to the want of such a work, and he thought that when vessels had reached that point it might be considered that their voyages were approaching completion, and that they did not need a harbour of Refuge. When the matter was first spoken of he thought on the face of it, it looked as if an affair which had occurred some time ago, and which was well known was about to be repeated. He referred to what had been known as "the Baby Jobs." Large sums of money had then been expended in the construction of works from which no benefit had ever been derived, and which were now worthless, and no doubt the arguments urged in favor of the construction of those works had been equally strong with those now adduced. It seemed to him, however, that the Minister of Public Works had presented the matter in a new light. It appeared now that the intention was that on the completion of the Intercolonial Railway steamers would land their contents and transfer them to that Railway at Rimouski or some other point in the St. Lawrence. His impression hitherto had always been that it was intended to have a Railway to Halifax, and that there the transfer from the Ocean steamers would take place. It would almost seem that the Minister of Public Works despaired of the completion of the Railway for a number of years, or of its practicability, or else of its being used when it was completed. He did not object to surveys being made in order that Government might ascertain the practicability of projects recommended for their consideration, but he thought it was as yet altogether too soon to decide what particular point on the Intercolonial Railway ought to be the point at which ships and rail should meet, and he trusted the House would not allow the Government to incur any expenditure in the matter until something more was known in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and when that road was almost built it would be quite time enough to decide at what point mails and passengers would be most beneficially landed.

Mr. FORTIN [Gaspé] asked to be allowed to add a few words with reference to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who had last spoken. From what had been said the House might think that he [Mr. Fortin] was peculiarly interested in the construction of the Harbour at Rimouski, and he desired to state that Gaspé would not profit by that harbour, as their vessels were only small fishing vessels, and they had already shelter for them at the Island of St. Barnaby. He had not spoken in favour of the harbour in the interests of his

constituents, but as a member of that House, and for the general good of the Dominion, and he might add that the Harbour would be a much greater advantage to the people of Ontario than to the people of Gaspé. He had not objected to appropriations of money for the construction of Harbours of Refuge in the upper lakes, because he considered those harbours necessary for the safe navigation of the lakes, and he was in favor of the harbour at Rimouski on similar grounds.

The motion was then carried.

REMUNERATION OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved an address for copies of correspondence with reference to the change made since Confederation, in the rates of remuneration of Postmasters throughout the Dominion, and in the mode of that remuneration.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER stated that he was instructed by the Postmaster General that the effect of the Act reducing the rates of postage had been a considerable decrease of revenue, but that the largely increased number of letters transmitted, was rapidly increasing the Revenue on which the remuneration of Postmasters was made, and in order to meet the decrease in remuneration which had resulted from the reduced rates of postage, a commission of 40 per cent was allowed to Postmasters instead of 30 per cent, the previous rate, and by that means the Postmaster General expected to prevent any reduction in the remuneration given to Postmasters. He further said that there was no correspondence that could be brought down which would give any information further than was contained in the report of the Postmaster General already before the House, and he asked therefore that the motion should not be pressed.

Mr. STEPHENSON said that his object had been to ascertain what reasons there had been for passing the order in Council. A year ago it was understood that the Postmasters did not receive a sufficient amount of remuneration, and it was then understood that under the new regulations they would receive more, but the fact was that they actually received less. In his own Town the Postmaster had received in 1867 a salary of \$1,600, whereas he now received only about \$1,300, and the same was the case throughout the Dominion. He believed that Postmasters in country places had been benefitted, but the reverse was the case with Town Postmasters, and he hoped the Government would see the necessity of looking into the matter, and, if necessary, giving Town Postmasters a

special rate. He did not desire to press his motion.

Motion accordingly withdrawn.

SEIZURES IN LAKE St. CLAIR.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved an address for all correspondence respecting a seizure by United States Customs officials of a steam tug and barge, the property of Hiram Little, Esq., a British subject, while engaged in legitimate trade in Canadian waters. He stated that for a number of years a large trade had been carried on in wood in the River St. Clair and Lake St. Clair by Canadians, that in 1866 the American Government had given a contract for the construction of a ship canal across the Flats in Lake St. Clair, on the Eastern side of what was known as the St. Clair Flats Canal, which canal was without doubt within Canadian jurisdiction. During the construction of that canal Canadians had been in the habit of delivering wood and other supplies necessary for the carrying on of the work, and on the occasion in question Mr. Little arrived with a steam tug and a barge loaded with wood for the contractor. At the time three American officials from Detroit chanced to be fishing on the spot, and they took upon themselves to seize Mr. Little's vessels and their loads and took them all to Detroit, and, as it were, confiscated them. After much trouble and expense Mr. Little was allowed to take the vessels away on entering into bonds for \$3,000, the wood being retained, and he expected that the Government would take action to relieve him from his position and obtain compensation for him. He (Mr. Stephenson) had reported the case to the Government at the time it occurred, but had received no answer, and did not know what steps had been taken in the matter. He thought, therefore, that the matter should be laid before the House and justice done in the matter without further unnecessary delay.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that correspondence was now going on between the Canadian and American Governments, but it was not complete, and he therefore asked that the motion should stand over for the present.

Motion allowed to stand over.

CANAL ENLARGEMENT,

Mr. MAGILL, of Hamilton, moved an address for copies of correspondence and instructions to Commissioners on the subject of canal enlargement, and of all other papers connected therewith. He said that the subject was one in which the country awaited with very great anxiety an an-

Mr. Stephenson.

nouncement of the policy of the Government. It was of such importance that it had occupied a very prominent place at the Quebec Conference in 1864, and had been a strong argument in favour of Confederation, as it was urged that the country joined together would be better able to deal with the matter than otherwise; and although much had been done, and many improvements effected, the great work of opening up the St. Lawrence still remained untouched. Referring to the rival project by French River and the Ottawa, he dwelt on the many advantages possessed by the St. Lawrence route, which he thought more than counterbalanced the difference in distance. If the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals were deepened to 15 feet, such an impetus would be given to the trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West that it would do more to encourage the development of the Nova Scotia Coal trade than an import duty of \$2.00 per ton. He trusted the matter would engross the attention of the Ministers, and that they would soon be able to announce their policy on that great question.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had no objection to the address, but there was really no correspondence yet, and he would suggest that that portion of the hon. member's address be dropped, and he could afterwards give notice when the report of the Canal Commissioners was submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON saw no necessity for delay. He understood that the Commissioners had furnished the report, and had dispersed.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentleman was mistaken. The Commissioners had not dispersed and had not yet completed their labors.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was very desirable that the House should have the report before it soon. The Government, from some form of discord, incapacity or feebleness of purpose, being unable to devise a policy of their own, and having devolved this duty on private gentlemen, who were utterly unknown to public life, should at least put the House in possession of such information as would enable them to furnish the Government with a policy if the Commission should be unable to do it. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman, who had so large a Parliamentary experience, blaming the Government for appointing this Commission. He had the practice of the British Government for a precedent. In England there was hardly a subject of importance that was not initiated by a

Commission. The Canal Commission had been appointed at the request of influential persons who were interested in having these improvements made, and it certainly was not a matter in which the Government was open to attack. He did not think it was too much to expect that the Government should be allowed time to examine papers before they were submitted to the House. He confessed that for himself the only papers relative to the matter he had read was a copy of the instructions issued to the Commission. He believed it would be in the power of the Government in a very few days to produce the papers, but at present it was not.

Mr. MAGILL said he would let his motion stand for a few days.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL quite agreed with the hon. member for Chateaugay that there was a growing practice in the country, which would not be easily got rid of if allowed to continue unchecked. He referred to this practice of the Government of handing over important measures to irresponsible persons in order to get rid of the difficulty of preparing a scheme. He could not remember any precedent in the British House for this course of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It might be justifiable, but if so, what were the thirteen hon. gentlemen opposite placed there for, if it was not to act as a standing Commission, whose business was to deal with great public measures of this kind. He apprehended that the true reason for the appointment of this Canal Commission was that there were various projects which the Government did not approve of, and this Commission was the easiest and most deceptive way of getting rid of them. What was the result? They had seen some notice in the newspapers, and had heard in the lobbies mysterious whispers about this Commission. They heard, and had read, in fact, that the Bay Verte Canal was to be constructed, and as a set-off to the Western people, a canal was to be constructed at Sault Ste. Marie, and the St. Lawrence canals were to be deepened. They could have had all that done by a Committee of the House. Committees could have been formed to ascertain the practicability of constructing works of this kind, and this House was the proper body to deal with them. This appointment of the Commission was an invasion of the functions, duties, and privileges of this House, and it handed over to gentlemen whose names had never been heard of in connection with works of this kind these important interests. He had travelled with one of the Commissioners, Mr. Shannon, a very entertaining gentleman.

recently from the east. The gentleman had come here probably after the report had been agreed on; but even admitting that Mr. Shannon had been present at the meetings of the Commission, what special knowledge had he, as a legal practitioner at Halifax, of public works of this kind. The whole system was a sham, and the hon. gentlemen opposite were bringing responsible Government into contempt by abdication of their functions, handing over their duties to private gentlemen, and shielding themselves under this Commission. What member of this House was to be influenced or induced to vote for or against this proposition because certain gentlemen had said yes or no. The opinions of this Commission were just worth so much and no more, as those of five or six other ordinary intelligent gentlemen. Yet the hon. gentleman opposite stated that this sort of thing was done in England, and consequently should be done here.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—It is not done in England.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—No, it was not done in England. The hon. gentlemen in this House were practical men and were sent to this Parliament for that reason, and they were the great Commission who were to decide this matter. The Ministry were the standing Commission, and it was for them to deal with these measures with the information they had, and to obtain for their measures the assent of the House. Now what did they see in this case? The Commission met in Ottawa to determine what canals should be undertaken. They knew very little about the matter and had to send for persons to instruct them as to what they should do. They had to visit the Public Works Department, and to interrogate the officials there as to facts on which they should base their conclusions. That might be the interpretation of Responsible Government by the hon. gentlemen opposite, but he was sorry to hear the great apostle of that principle recommend that the Government should hand over their prerogative in this manner.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, said the Government intended to take the responsibility of these works on themselves (hear, hear,) but they had not had time yet to come before the House with any proposition, besides the Government was like a private individual in such matters, they were interested in obtaining all information necessary before entering into large expenditures. There was no better means of obtaining information on matters in which legislation was to take place than to refer it to a Commission. The hon. gentlemen

opposite had asserted that there was no such practice in England. It was a well known fact that with the exception of fortifications most public works were undertaken by private corporations. When it was proposed to construct fortifications in Canada, Commissioners were sent here to enquire where were the proper places for them. In every Government, Commissions were employed for such purposes. In the enlargement of canals were two great questions, the engineering question and the commercial question. Who was better acquainted with the commercial interests of this country than Mr. Hugh Allan? And where was an engineer of greater experience than Mr. Gzowski to be secured? Was not the member for North Lanark a Commissioner appointed to proceed to the West Indies, to enquire as to the best mode of extending our trade with them (cheers and laughter). The Government would form its policy on the recommendations of the Canal Commissioners, and assume all responsibility for action thereon and for such appropriations as they might occasion. They would meet Parliament on the question of the acceptance or the rejection of the Commissioners' recommendations. He hoped and was sure the Government would be able out of that report to frame a policy that would meet the wants of the country.

Mr. BLANCHET was surprised that the member for North Lanark should reflect upon the appointment of Commissions. He belonged to a Government from 1862 till 1864 that had managed the affairs of the country by Commissions. He had also been concerned in a North West Commission, which did not turn out successful. He was unable to carry the commission in his pocket on that occasion (hear and laughter). The fact was the appointment of a Commission in this instance was the best step the Government could have taken to procure the information needed; and the qualifications and high standing of its members were a guarantee that both their statements and recommendations were entitled to respect (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT did not believe that any advantage was likely to flow from the Canal Commission. He agreed with the member for North Lanark that as to the improvement of our internal navigation generally this House was as well informed as it could be by the Commission. The Government had the able reports of the Public Works Department, and those of their own engineers, and were in as good a position to arrive at a sound opinion as to what ought to be done as were these Commissioners, and far better. True, they

were men of high standing, but he did not believe they possessed any speciality beyond the Government and the House to enable them to arrive at a conclusion. Further, as their appointment, giving them so wide a scope, obliged them to go into a great many questions which the Government could not have found it necessary to take up, the Government were better able to judge of the resources of the country at their disposal, and of its necessities, than any Commissioners (cheers). He therefore regretted their appointment. The comparison of this Commission with that to the West Indies was what called him to his feet, because he did think no possible analogy could be established between them. The latter had to visit the West Indies, which the Government could not have done, they having such a disposition to keep their places (hear, hear, and laughter).

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—It establishes my position as to the principle of the Commission.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—This principle ought to be laid down—That the Government should appoint a Commission where they required the aid of skill, where persons possessed a speciality pertaining to certain subjects. That was not the case with the question of the canals, and if it was, the proper parties had not been appointed. He did not deny the report might be an able one; but he would be much surprised if they found in it anything not already in the knowledge of the Government.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he would not have risen if the hon. member for North Lanark had not selected the Nova Scotia member of the Commission for his criticism. Did he consider that holding a high and distinguished position at the bar was any reason why a gentleman should not be able to give his attention to public matters? He was the last member who should treat that fact as a reason of the sort. It would have been but fair to state that such were his abilities, social qualities, and talents for public business, that the county and city of Halifax, the capital of Nova Scotia, had again and again elected him as their representative; and that he was for years a member of the Government. This discussion was ill-timed. If members believed it improper for the Government to avail itself of the first commercial talent, and the ablest suggestions with reference to this business, the time to make their objections was a year ago, when the intention was first announced. The House then having made no opposition it was a little late in the day for hon. gentlemen to do it now (cheers).

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—No, no. I opposed it.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER was surprised to hear the member for Chateauguay denouncing this Commission, for he held in his hand a vote given by him for a similar commercial commission requiring special talent.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—No.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—But when a vote was proposed for the expenditure of a million and a half, on fortifications, he placed his opinion on record that it was due to the public interest the Government should be relieved of the responsibility by the appointment of Commissioners to consider where they should be constructed; and having thus sanctioned the principle in a matter where it was not relevant, he thought that hon. member was precluded from raising his present objections.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—I did raise that objection.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—The suggestion of the Canal Commission came from the House and not the Government. He had headed a deputation which solicited this step, and the House having at the time sanctioned the Government's course, it was too late now to try to elicit its censure. The Commissioners having consented to serve, having withdrawn their talents and labours from their own business, and cheerfully worked for the public he thought gentlemen opposite, in reference to them, should have awaited their report without prejudging their labours and endeavouring to destroy confidence in them (cheers).

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL could understand now how it was that the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, founded the reputation he bore in his own Province as a great stump speaker, and as the accomplished and wily conqueror of its other Minister in the Cabinet here (laughter). Had he (Hon. Mr. Macdougall) not spoken of the Nova Scotia Commissioner as an able lawyer and a gentleman of talent and respectability? His argument was not in depreciation of Mr. Shannon, but that his being a distinguished and hard-worked lawyer, he was not in a position to come here and inform hon. members as to where canals should be constructed. With regard to the Commission spoken of by the Minister of Militia, it was appointed partly from the Government, which was responsible for its report through him (Mr. Macdougall). A member of the Nova Scotia Government, also, was on that Commission. The case was unfortunate as an illustration in another point of view: it was unfortunate as an example of the benefits of a Commission, that after

the travels of its members and the exposure of their lives on the high seas and in foreign parts, and after a report which, he thought, would be admitted displayed a good deal of industry, that Commission fell still-born. Its work was never acted on either by the Government or this House. The carrying out of its recommendations would have developed the resources of the country in an important direction. Even hon. gentlemen opposite must admit that neither the Government nor the House had acted as promptly and judiciously, as they ought, on that occasion. As Mr. Smith wrote on one occasion as regards England, Government Commissions were generally devised for the purpose of concealing or distorting information already accessible, and which should be put to a proper use. As to Mr. Allan, he stood at the head of the commercial element, and was, no doubt well schooled in all the subjects connected with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the transportation of the products of this country to the old world. He (Mr. Macdougall) would have summoned him before this House on a special Committee on this subject. As a witness he would have been useful; but as a Commissioner to occupy the place of the Government, the fact of his being a merchant in such circumstances, disqualified him from giving an intelligent, reliable opinion upon this great subject. (Hear, hear.)

It being six o'clock,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the House adjourn till to-morrow, as there was very little business on the paper. After some obstructions from the leaders of the Opposition the motion was carried.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 2, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

THE NORTH WEST.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a Bill to make further provision for the government of the North West Territory. The Bill was read a first time, and ordered for a second reading on Monday next.

THE ARBITRATION.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST deferred his motion respecting the Arbitration question until Monday, in the expectation that the papers would be printed by that time.

THE CANAL COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr. DICKY gave notice that he would enquire of the Government whether the Canal Commission have made their report, and whether it will be submitted to Parliament. Also, whether the Government Engineers have made any plan or estimate with respect to the Bay Verte Canal.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU gave notice of an enquiry of the Government respecting interference by the Montreal Water Police with the erection of stands on the occasion of the recent Regatta.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST gave notice of a motion respecting the Post Office at Riviere Ouelle.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 2, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Several petitions were received and referred.

Mr. GIBBS presented a petition from the Ontario Bank for an extension of its charter.

A petition was received from the Municipal Council of Frontenac, praying for a charter to construct a railway from Kingston to Pembroke.

PAPERS, &c.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN submitted papers relative to the leasing of a portion of land on the Lachine Canal to the Montreal Warehousing Company.

NEW BILLS.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Act of 1868.—Carried.

Mr. CRAWFORD, of Leeds, moved to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railroad.—Carried.

Mr. SNIDER moved for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise the town of Owen Sound to collect harbour dues, and for other purposes.—Carried.

Mr. YOUNG moved to introduce a Bill to naturalise certain aliens. He explained he did not propose to interfere with the

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

law, but merely to confirm in their naturalization rights many persons who had failed to comply with some of the technical requirements of the law. At present a certificate from the Courts that the oath had been taken was required, and many were disqualified from voting owing to the neglect of this formality. The provisions of the Bill were to the effect that all who, in good faith, prior to 1868, took the naturalization oath, should be confirmed in their privileges. If the first reading were carried, he would move its reference to a Select Committee to consider its various clauses.

Motion carried.

MONTREAL WAREHOUSING COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved the reference of the papers respecting the Montreal Warehousing Company's case of land on the Lachine Canal, to the Printing Committee.—Carried.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL,
REFERRING TO PUBLIC LANDS OF
MANITOBA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER submitted a Message from His Excellency, consisting of an Order in Council and memorandum, establishing, under the provisions of the Act, 33 Vic., chap. 3, regulations respecting the public lands in the Province of Manitoba.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER proceeded to explain that the Government had had under consideration the disposal of the public lands in Manitoba, and the different interests of the various classes of that Province. Those regulations now brought down related to the reserve for the half breeds, and the mode of its administration. There was a reserve of the vested rights of the Hudson's Bay Company in every township. Every settler would be entitled to a free grant apart from the Company's and the half breed's lands. Any one desirous of promptly obtaining the title to a lot, might do so by paying a dollar an acre. Each lot would consist of 160 acres. Every private and officer of the Volunteers who went to Manitoba, who might settle there, would be entitled to a lot besides the lot bestowed him as his absolute property (cheers). He thought those regulations would show Government had adopted the best possible policy for the settlement of the country.

Mr. MILLS asked information as to the size of the sections. Last year, they had been fixed at 800 acres, and now there appeared a change to 640 acres.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—The plan of the survey of last year was departed from.

Mr. STEPHENSON asked if the Volunteers who received their discharges would be entitled to land.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that all the Volunteers, discharged or not, who settled there would receive land.

Mr. D. MACDOUGALL asked whether the condition of settlement was required in the case of the half breeds.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied, their case was different from that of new comers. The 1,400,000 acres reserved to them was to settle their rights of property.

Mr. T. FERGUSON was disappointed at this intention. He thought this land was to be given only on condition of settlement and as the law declared. He was sorry that provision had been departed from. He hoped the Government would reconsider this matter, and change their policy. If the half breeds learned they were required to settle on their lands, in order to obtain them they will become citizens of the country and travel from their homes no more.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER replied that the reading of the papers would show that all the regulations in respect to the Manitoba Act had been complied with.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he would hardly have risen to speak on this occasion, but that he did not wish the statements which had just been made to go abroad unchallenged. The Government had reversed the policy which had been deliberately agreed to, with respect to the survey of the lands in Manitoba. They had announced as their policy that they would hold out greater inducements to settlers than the United States, that each settler should receive 200 acres of land instead of 160 acres, and that the townships should be larger than the townships in the United States in order that when municipalities should be incorporated in the North West there should be sufficient area for them. He wished to let this fact be known, and that the Government had changed their policy, and now offered the comparatively paltry grant of 160 acres of land. Such a policy was a mistake. There was land enough there and to spare to offer greater inducements to settlers. There was a complete violation of the policy of last session with respect to the lands of that territory. It appeared that the rights of half breeds in their lands were to be placed under the jurisdiction and control and subject to the laws to be enacted by the legislature of Manitoba. It might be

said, and it was asserted by the Government organs, that this was a proper system, but every one in the House who was at all acquainted with the matter, knew very well that the half-breeds had little familiarity with Government matters. In the recent elections they gave their votes as they were directed by those whom they recognized as leaders (cries of "No, No"). Hon. gentlemen opposite said "no, no," but he said "yes, yes."

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—No, No.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—It was so, and he had a letter from the Bishop of that country, stating by his own hand that he had selected from Lower Canada, men whom he had intended to take with him to act as representatives in Manitoba, and it turned out that no less than three of those men were elected, while loyal gentlemen in that country had been excluded and withdrawn from office. He saw it stated that the three representatives taken from Lower Canada had no legal right to the seats that they held, because they had not complied with the terms of the Act, but he was of opinion that there was no legal objection to any one being in that Assembly that the electors might have selected under the provisions of the Act. He believed that the Act was purposely framed so that there should be no exclusion, no condition of eligibility, and in order that the hon. gentlemen opposite might be enabled to send out their pliant tools to make laws that would suit their ends. He for one had great apprehension that the rights of the half-breeds would be sacrificed if left at the mercy of such men. He believed such was the policy at the bottom of the scheme as the public would yet see.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said it was not to be supposed that the Government could originate a policy to suit the hon. member for North Lanark. As for the charge brought against the Hon. Minister of Militia that he advised certain friends of his to go out to this blessed country, he (Mr. Howe) would like to know who had a right to question him for that. The argument was hardly worthy of a moment's notice. When the papers came before the House he was sure that the Government would be able to show that if the policy of the Government was changed it was only for good and sufficient reasons.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said it must be remembered that in bringing down a land policy for the North West, it was not for Manitoba alone, but for the whole of the Red River territory. If it was really desirable to build up that great country, as the House intended to do—

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS appealed to the House if they were not anxious to see the great North West country developed, and if so, it was important that a policy should be framed which would not only attract to Manitoba a large Canadian emigration, but also the great tide of emigration from Europe, which now flowed to the United States. In the future it would be found that the Government had acted wisely in conforming the land policy of the North West to that of the neighbouring union, which was understood in Europe, and which had worked so well. It had been said that the Government were disposed to prevent emigration from going to the North West, but the fact was, that their policy was to develop that country, and have it settled as early as possible. With regard to the election of Lower Canadians to seats in the Local Legislature in Manitoba, he believed the people of that Province had a right to exercise their privilege to elect whoever they pleased to represent them. He knew but one of the gentlemen personally, Captain Howard, and from what he knew of him he believed that the people of Manitoba would find in him a valuable representative. These remarks, at this stage of the measure, were rather premature, but he could not let the remarks of the hon. member for North Lanark pass without some comment.

Mr. SCATCHERD was surprised to hear the hon. member say that Government had encouraged emigration to the North-West. He defied them to point to a single proof that such had ever been their policy. In the first place, the Canadians who had gone to settle there, were driven out of the country, and now the Volunteers were to be disbanded and only two small Companies were to be retained.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—We want them to settle there.

Mr. SCATCHERD—Did his hon. friend suppose that the Volunteers from Ontario would care to settle in a country which was ruled by the very men who had driven loyal Canadians from it last year. From the course which the Government had pursued so far, it was evident that they had no desire to see the North-West Territory settled.

SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION AND SEAMANSHIP.

Mr. PELLETIER asked whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for the establishment of Public Schools of Navigation and Seamanship with Board of

Hon. Mr. Morris.

Examiners at the different seaports of the Dominion, or at any one of them?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied that the matter was now under the consideration of Government.

THE WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. MERRITT moved for papers, and the report having reference to the works on the Welland Canal known as the Lake Erie Level. In making this motion, he would remind the Government that they had promised last session to make some improvements on the Canal during the summer, but no progress whatever had been made in the matter. He knew that there had been difficulties to prevent this work from being accomplished, and he therefore asked that the report of the engineer should be laid before the House explaining the state of the work and the difficulties to be surmounted.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Government had no doubt promised last session to improve the Welland Canal, but they could not control the elements, and heavy slides had taken place on the east side of the Deep Cut. These slides, of course, were not expected, and were very expensive. The fact was, that in one place, for a long distance the Canal was so narrow from these slides that two vessels could not pass each other. The Government would be able to come down to the House and ask for a vote of money in order to try to provide against these land slides in future. The cause of these slides was this. When the Canal was commenced the work was done by a company, who, as they made the cutting, threw the earth and stones on the top of the banks at each side, and it was the pressure of these piles of rubbish that caused these slides. The engineers were of opinion that unless these piles were removed from the banks they would all slide in, and have to be removed from the bottom of the Canal by dredging, and it would cost a great deal less to remove them from their present position. The Government would therefore ask for an appropriation to remove them.

Mr. McCALLUM was satisfied with the explanation of the Minister of Public Works so far as it went, but thought it did not go far enough. Government had proposed to proceed with the work year after year, and yet nothing was done. He thought that Port Colborne could never be made a suitable harbour for the terminus of the Welland Canal, and pointed out the greater advantages of Port Maitland. A few years ago the whole district had been flooded by a freshet on the Grand River,

the people on claiming compensation from the Government had been told that nothing could be done, and although it was sometimes said that the Crown could not err, he thought the Government had very frequently done great injury to the people. He would not dwell on the subject further as when the report of the Canal Commission was brought down there would be full opportunity for discussion.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) thought the member for Lincoln was deserving of the thanks of his constituents for so persistently bringing this matter before Government. Promises made by the Government on the subject time after time were still unfulfilled, and if the hon. member really wanted to have the work carried out he would suggest to him, as the only means of attaining his end that he should leave the Government side of the House and join the Opposition.

Mr. STREET (Welland) very much regretted that the Lake Erie level was still unattained, and everyone interested in the works erected on the Welland Canal especially regretted it. That level was necessary in order to carry the trade of the country. The Minister of Public Works had, however, explained why the work could not be carried out during the present year, but he was glad to know that the Government would ask a vote for the purpose. He thought, however, they should not proceed on mere suggestions of members of the House, but should be careful to obtain the advice of the most competent men. As to the obstructions which had been spoken of their removal might cost a large amount of money, but he was sure there was no impossibility in the matter, and he certainly considered it absolutely necessary that the waters of Lake Erie should be obtained in some way or another. He would not further take up the time of the House on that occasion.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought the present a favourable opportunity for calling the attention of the House to the very great danger of a policy on questions like the present based on the representations of members of that House who chanced to live in the locality where those works were to be constructed. He had on a former occasion, and when sitting on the other side of the House, contended that the Welland Canal was a great public work, in which every person in the Dominion was interested. It was quite true that the waters of the canal had been made use of. The Government had conceded great privileges in order to encourage the establishment of manufactures. The right of using the surplus water had

been granted on almost nominal terms for that purpose, and a very important manufacturing interest had sprung up in consequence, but a very great expense had been entailed on the country. The policy of the Government had been to endeavor to obtain the Lake Erie level, the water having hitherto been supplied from the interior of the country. The Government had been accused of breaking its promise, but he thought they must act on the advice of men who were experts in the matter, and who understood the effects that would be produced by the changes proposed, and when he had been urged to expedite the works he had been advised by the Engineers, that if the water should be brought down suddenly, the probability was that the Canal would be closed up. Only a few years ago a slide had taken place, which had necessitated the expenditure of an enormous sum of money, and it was the fear of a recurrence that caused the delay. The Minister of Public Works had told them that acting on the advice of the officers of his Department he proposed asking for a vote of money to complete the work, by removing the superincumbent weight of earth on the banks and so remove the fear of a further slide. He was surprised to hear, however, from the member for Monck that a new scheme was proposed, and that, what the most eminent engineers had advised would not do. He told them that Port Colborne would not do, but that the Canal must be constructed to Port Maitland. Thus the House must see that it would never do to trust to the opinions of members. He might refer in support of this to the case of the St. Peter's Canal in Cape Breton. That canal was in course of construction at the time of Confederation when some sixty or seventy thousand dollars had been expended on it, and now that it had been completed they were told that it was of no value.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—No, No.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that the hon. gentleman might say "No, No," but he had been assured by gentlemen from the country that it was of no practical value, and would have to be enlarged to make it of any use whatever, and further than this they had also been told by two representatives from the country that another canal altogether would have to be built. He stated this to show the great danger of entering upon works of this kind without first obtaining the advice of responsible officers of the Government selected for the purpose on account of their superior skill. Reverting to the question of the enlargement of the Welland Canal, he thought that when that

matter was laid before the House it ought to be most carefully considered, but he had no hesitation in saying beforehand that he was entirely opposed to the expenditure of any large sum of money in the enlargement of that canal. The Welland Canal was sufficiently large to accommodate all the trade of Canada, and very much more, and he was decidedly opposed to any expenditure which would simply result in benefitting the Americans. He would have no objection to the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals being made common to the Americans, and then if any enlargement should be necessary the Americans could contribute their share of the money, and the improvements could be easily accomplished.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria) said that when the hon. gentleman spoke of the St. Peter's Canal he spoke of a matter of which he knew nothing. He (Mr. Ross) had, a few days previously, submitted a statement to the Public Works Department, which showed that in one year 503 vessels had passed through that canal, and if it were properly enlarged fully double that number would pass through. He trusted that the matter of the additional canal which had been recommended would obtain the consideration of the Government, and that in the meantime they would see that the present canal was kept in good working order.

Mr. McCALLUM (Monck) desired to add a few remarks to what had been said by the hon. member for North Lanark. He remembered that when that gentleman had been Minister of Public Works he had professed a great interest in the work in question, and on the strength of that interest had attempted to represent a constituency in the neighborhood, but had been rejected, and it was hardly right to ignore the matter now. He might add that the Government had rented a large amount of water power, and that the mills had had to remain idle for the most valuable part of the year for want of water. Further, the House would remember that he had urged the hon. member for Lanark when Commissioner of Public Works to have the embankments strengthened, and he had only been laughed at, but it was now shown that if his recommendations had been acted on, the hon. gentleman would by an expenditure of \$1,200 have saved the country \$30,000.

Mr. McDONALD (Glengarry) speaking of the St. Peter's Canal, thought it was much to be regretted that the canal had not been made sufficiently large in the first instance as it had been but a very short time constructed, and they were now told that unless enlarged it would be of

no use. He could not find from the public accounts that that canal had ever produced any revenue, and he did not see that any benefit would occur to the Dominion even if the Canal were enlarged. As an old Contractor, he considered that to enlarge the Canal would cost as much as had been expended on the Canal when first constructed, and he thought the whole system of dealing with the works ought to be changed, and that nothing could be undertaken except on the report and advice of reliable scientific men appointed for the purpose.

Mr. MERRITT (Lincoln)—Referring to what had been said by the hon. member for North Lanark, thought that members living on the spot—where the works required to be undertaken, were the very ones to advise in the matter. The matter of the Lake Erie Level was no new matter, and the necessity of the work had engaged the attention of the country at large. In 1869, there had been sufficient water to supply the Canal alone, independent of the works established in its neighbourhood, and no one who knew anything of the trade of the country would deny that if for one month, navigation should be closed, the loss to the country would be ten times the amount that was now required to be expended. He trusted that the Government would lose no time in asking an appropriation for the work.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal), thought the question of the enlargement of the Welland Canal one of the most important that could engage the attention of the House, as that Canal formed one of the great arteries of internal navigation, and he was confident that any reasonable sum would be granted by the House and justified by the country. He thought the Americans, instead of being excluded from our Canals, should be encouraged to use them. He hoped the Government would rise above all local considerations, and do what was necessary in the interests of the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell), said it had been announced that the St. Peter's Canal, though only just completed, was totally inadequate to the requirements for which it was built, and he thought the Government that had planned that work, of which he believed the Hon. President of the Council had been the head, were very much at fault in the matter.

Hon. Mr. HOWE rose to state that the work had been originated by a Government of which he was the head, while it had been carried on by a Government of which his hon. friend, the President of the Council, was the head. He added, that as the work had been commenced with the

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

limited resources of Nova Scotia, it had naturally not been made so extensive and perfect as the canals of Canada, but they took it for granted that the Dominion would now make that canal as good as the others.

Mr. MILLS resumed, saying that the explanation made by the Hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces merely shewed that he, as well as the President of the Council, was responsible for the faulty construction of the canal in question. As to the St. Lawrence canals, it had been a well understood condition of Confederation that those canals should be enlarged, and that enlargement was of the utmost consequence in order to obtain control of the trade of the Western States, and also in order that connection should be maintained with the North West.

Mr. JONES [Leeds and Grenville] thought that in the discussion of this subject the first question should be—What will most benefit Canada? He fully admitted that it was well to encourage intercourse with the Americans, but not at the expense of millions of money belonging to Canada. Already twenty million dollars had been expended on the St. Lawrence Canals, and sixteen millions on the Grand Trunk running parallel with them, while the interior of the country had been altogether neglected. As to the Canal Commission, he objected to its appointment altogether as being utterly useless, but, it being appointed, he regretted exceedingly that the Ottawa District was not represented on it. He thought the canals were already sufficiently large for the requirements of Canadian trade, and in attempting to facilitate the transport of the products of the Western States to the Seaboard and thence to England, we were simply helping them to compete at Liverpool with our own products. The construction of the Sault Ste Marie Canal he, however, regarded as an absolute necessity as a link in the great chain of communication with the Red River.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON raised a point of order, as the motion before the chair was simply for the production of certain papers, to which a general discussion on the Canal System of the country was entirely irrelevant.

The SPEAKER, however, decided, that although members might have enlarged on the question before them, he had not been called upon to check them.

Mr. CARMICHAEL (Pictou, N. S.), referred to the condition of the St. Peter Canal as being very much in need of repairs, and urged that unless Government

gave it speedy attention vessels would be unable to pass through.

He said the walls of the St. Peter's Canal were falling in. He recommended its repair and improvement.

Mr. RYAN believed that if the Welland Canal should be enlarged, and also the St. Lawrence, they would give employment to thousands within the Dominion, and increase our carrying trade and commerce. He hoped the Commission would recommend such improvements.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL read a portion of Hon. Mr. Miller's report respecting the propriety of enlarging the St. Peter's Canal, and the construction of others for the extension of the trade of the Island of Cape Breton. He cited this case as an illustration of the danger of beginning Canals before they were sure of the means of completing them. He himself had favored the improvement of this very St. Peter's canal, and was not opposed to one more than the other apart from public grounds.

Mr. MAGILL said that the hon. gentleman took part in the convention leading to Confederation, the basis of which was the creating of internal improvements. It ill became him, therefore, a leading friend of the new constitution, to oppose those promising works—the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals. As to American produce competing with ours, in Europe, what fear need we have of it if we enjoyed a large share of the carrying trade? If there were any public works more deserving than others it was the improvement of those valuable works, so well calculated to draw a larger trade to our waters.

The motion was then carried.

THE FISHERIES.

Mr. MILLS moved for an address for the regulations and papers originating with the Governor in Council relating to the Fisheries. He said he moved for these papers because the Government had lacked moral force to carry out the Act, and that the public were praying for the performance of duties which the Department had ordered should not be performed. He desired to know how far the complaints on these subjects were well or ill founded.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the Government were desirous of giving the fullest information on this subject. He was instructed by the Minister of Marine to say the correspondence was very voluminous, and that if he called at the office and selected such portions as he wanted, they would be printed. The protection of the river

fisheries, though very difficult, had turned out highly beneficial. The supply of fish had gratifyingly increased. He was certain the papers would show the hon. gentleman was mistaken in his opinions on the subject.

Motion carried.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS.

In reply to the question of Mr. Cartwright, as to when the papers touching the withdrawal of the garrisons, etc., could be produced.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said they were expected to be ready in three or four days.

The motion was allowed to lie over.

REPEAL OF DUTIES.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON, in the absence of Hon. Mr. Dorion, moved that the House go into Committee of the whole on a future day to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to abolish the duties on coal, coke, flour, wheat and other grains.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS hoped the motion would not be pressed in advance of his financial statement.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON consented to let it stand.

THE PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. BLAKE moved the discharge of the order on the resumption of the adjourned debate on his motion for correspondence touching the arbitration. He said the principal objects of his motion had been attained both as regards the production of papers and the ascertainment of the policy of the Government on the subject.

BUSINESS FOR FRIDAY.

On the motion for adjournment,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked what Government business would be entered upon tomorrow.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the Census Bill would be taken up and perhaps Sir Francis Hinck's currency resolutions.

The House then adjourned, it being a quarter to six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Messrs. Ryan, Benson, Sanborn, Allan, Read, and Skead, presented petitions.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN, Chairman of Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, reported favourably from that Committee respecting petitions of Union Bank of Lower Canada, the Quebec Bank, and the Great Western Railway.

The report was adopted.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT gave notice of motions respecting steam communication with Sydney, C.B., and the improvement of Mabou Harbour and False Bay Beach, C.B.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD, in making the motion of which he had previously given notice, said that portion of the Intercolonial Railway to which the motion referred, viz.: between Amherst and Truro, was one of the most important sections of the Intercolonial Railway; for it was a link in the communication with the American and Canadian systems of railways. The western extension line from St. John to Bangor would be completed next autumn, and it was therefore very advisable that the link in question should be finished with as little delay as possible. In addition, he stated, that if his hon. friend from Sherbrooke succeeded in completing the branch road by Moose Head Lake, there would be an air-line between Montreal and Halifax, in fact, the shortest possible route. Under those circumstances it was very desirable that the Government should press the construction of the road. He would therefore enquire of them, when that portion of the Intercolonial Railway lying between Amherst and Truro would be ready for traffic?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL understood that the road in question comprised sections 4, 7 and 12. The contractors were to finish 4 and 12 by July 1871, and section 7 by July 1872. He hoped, however, that the road would be completed by the close of the present year.

THE CANAL COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said during two previous sessions he had felt it his duty to call the attention of the House to the important subject of the Bay Verte Canal. But he was not under the necessity of again speaking of its importance, inasmuch as he found there was no difference of opinion on the subject anywhere. All the persons to whom he had spoken on the subject, whether Ontario or Quebec men, acknowledged that it was a work of Dominion im-

portance. It was with much gratification that he recognized the existence of such a feeling, for it showed that all parties, East and West, can look at public questions not from a sectional but from a national point of view. Without further preface he asked the Government:—

Whether the Canal Commission have made their report, and if so, will it be submitted to Parliament, and when? also, whether any report and estimates have been made by the engineers appointed to survey a route for a canal between the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Commissioners had not yet made their report, and he was unable to say when it would be laid before Parliament. As respects the latter part of the question, the report of the officers employed by the Board of Works had not been received, but it was expected very shortly.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said as the subject of Canals was again before the Senate, he would ask to be permitted to make a few remarks in reference to the St. Peter's Canal, which, in his place in the House, he had made the subject of an enquiry of the Government a day or two ago. What he then said had been attempted to be misrepresented in another place, where the subject seemed to be little understood. The impression seemed to exist that St. Peter's Canal was a recent undertaking, and that blame attached somewhere that it was already inadequate to the wants it was meant to meet. It had even been insinuated, but he was happy to say in a quarter where such an insinuation was harmless, that this canal originated in party necessities, and was completed as the reward of party support. He therefore desired to give a short history of St. Peter's Canal. The agitation in favour of that work commenced in Cape Breton and even in Nova Scotia over fifty years ago. As early as 1825, a survey of a proposed Canal at St. Peter's, was made by Francis Hall, C. E., at the expense of the Provincial Government. Again, in 1851, another survey was made by C. W. Fairbanks, C. E. Next, in 1853, a survey was ordered by the Government of Nova Scotia under Captain P. J. S. Barry, whose plan was adopted, and the Canal commenced on the 7th of September, 1854. It would thus appear, that the undertaking had been a long time agitated, that 46 years ago, the first survey was made by an order of Government at the public expense, and that its construction was commenced according to a plan adop-

ted, nearly 17 years ago. Now, from these facts it might fairly be inferred that St. Peter's Canal had not been suddenly commenced to meet any party exigency, or promote any local or personal ends. The Government that carried the Act providing for the completion of the work was the strongest that ever existed in Nova Scotia, and could have held power without the support of the friends of the St. Peter's Canal. In 1856 the work was suspended for a time, and in the same year, at the instance of the Government, William H. Talcott C.E., examined the work and made a full report of its condition. In 1858, another survey and report were made by James Laurie, a Scotch engineer in charge of the Nova Scotia railways. After all these surveys and reports be able engineers, it could hardly be alleged that the work was either commenced or carried on without a desire to obtain the fullest scientific information. If this canal was insufficient for purposes it was now required for, and needed enlargement, it must be recollected, the plans were adopted 17 years ago, when the revenue of Nova Scotia could not afford a large outlay; when the population of Cape Breton was about half of what it is to day; when operations in the boundless coal mines of the Island were comparatively speaking, in their infancy, and when its other great resources had not obtained their present development. He had been represented elsewhere as saying the canal was wholly useless in its present state, but he had said nothing of the kind, as over 500 vessels had used it during the past season. What he did say was that to be as beneficial to the country as it should be, and might be, it ought to be enlarged, and he now repeated that assertion. The enlargement was more required in width than in depth, although both would be necessary. It was too narrow for the smallest class of paddle steamers. It had, however, a depth of 13 feet. The man who would assert, as had been asserted elsewhere, that only fishing smacks could float in 13 feet of water, must know as much about a fishing smack as he does about St. Peter's Canal, which apparently is very little. Nor was it surprising the work required repairs so soon, as only a very small portion of it, that between the two locks, had been walled in, and the cutting is said to be the deepest in America. The canal had not been completed in the manner usual with first-class canals for want of means, and hence the early necessity for repairs. When he said this work had, in one sense, been only half completed, he meant the line of communication of which it is a part was only half completed, and it would remain so until the portage at

East Bay, separating the waters of the Bras d'Or Lake from Spanish River and the ocean, had also been opened. He had hopes the Government would well consider the importance of this needed public improvement on its merits, and with a due regard to the claims of the inhabitants of that valuable section of the Dominion. The great resources of Cape Breton only required development to make the island a prosperous community. These resources, he was sorry to say, seemed to be better appreciated across the border than by ourselves. Canals and railways were what were required to advance that prosperity. The fisheries and coal mines of the Island were almost inexhaustable. Of its agricultural capabilities and other advantages an eminent American engineer, Mr. Talcott said in his report on the Canal: "The lands which I saw on the South Westerly shore of the Lake for several miles from St. Peter's, are capable of being highly cultivated and of sustaining a dense population. The means for promoting such cultivation, seem to be abundant, particularly lime which now is so extensively used for agricultural purposes with great benefit. The opening of a convenient navigation between the Bras d'Or Lake and St. Peter's Bay, can hardly fail to invite to the shores of this lake a better class of citizens than could be expected without it. It must give additional value to all land bordering on this vast inland sea. It will also invite the use of steam in navigating the lake, and also coastwise to Halifax, securing greater celerity and frequency of the mails and thereby stimulate agriculture and trade, the effects of which will be felt at your largest cities, and by a reflex and reciprocal influence, benefit almost every part of the Province. Various other advantages, in a political point of view will be felt which I will not presume to mention." He would place this disinterested opinion of an eminent scientific man, in the discharge of his professional duty, and with his professional reputation at stake, against the ignorant assertions and mean insinuations of a disappointed factionist who in opposition is ready to run a muck against everything he supported while in office. He would state that the Bras d'Or Lake, bays and inlets cover an area of about 500 square miles, with a shore line of over 500 miles. They divide Cape Breton nearly in two, affording the finest water facilities with every portion of the the Island. According to Mr. Laurie, C. E., for small vessels bound from Sydney to the westward of Cape Canso, the canal would effect a saving of 30 to 35 miles in

distance, and for vessels taking their departure for Barra Straits, which are situated near the centre of the Island, and of the Bras d'Or Lake, there would a saving of 130 miles. To make the entire circuit by water from one side of the isthmus to the other, by passing round Scatterie, the distance would be 200 miles. This 200 miles is reduced to half a mile, by St. Peter's Canal, and the dangerous navigation round Scatterie, is avoided. Although Mr. Laurie thought coal vessels would not generally use the canal, the experience of last year had shown the contrary. He had trespassed on the attention of the House because he considered it proper that more should be known about St. Peter's Canal, in order that it might receive fair consideration. But he would not have troubled the Senate again so soon on the subject, had he not considered it due to himself to repel the insinuations and correct the misrepresentations of a Mr. William McDougall, "whoever he is," in another place. He believed, however, he was the same man of that name who would like to be Governor of Manitoba, but couldn't. It was said he is a member of the House of Commons, but he "did not know whether he was or not," as grave doubts have been expressed on that point. From all he could learn the individual in question was a played out political harlequin, shunned and despised by all parties. He was said to have a delicate relish for official pap, for which he can in turns be "all things to all men." Within the last few months this individual had been acting the part of a political vagabond, wandering about the country endeavouring to draw some following to his standard.

THE FISHERIES.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL stated to the House, in moving the second reading of the Bill, "to further amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels," that its object was to make some slight changes which had been found necessary in working out the present law. Under the existing Act, an officer was bound to take the offending vessel into the nearest port and deliver her to the Custom's officer. It had been found impracticable to follow such a course in all cases; sometimes, the nearest port might not be the most secure place for the vessel, and to enforce the requisite proceedings. Therefore it was thought desirable to alter the law so that the officer seizing the vessel might take her into any other port, according as he might judge most advisable for the public interests. Last season, when a vessel had been taken into the nearest port, suspicions arose that there was a design

Hon. Mr. Miller.

laid to release the vessel. It had also been found that the provisions for the division of the seized property worked unsatisfactorily. As the law now stood, after the necessary expenses were deducted, the money was equally divided, one half going to the officer in command and the other to the Government, the latter, however, paying a very large proportion of the expenses. The system worked unsatisfactorily, inasmuch as the commanding officer had the sole right to the one-half, and need not divide it with the other officers or crew. It was proposed now that all property seized should be sold under regulations made from time to time by the Governor in Council, who would also apportion three-fourths, or less, of the net remainder left after paying the necessary expenses, among the officers and crew of the vessel making the seizure. In this connection, he must take an opportunity of alluding to the very satisfactory manner in which the service had been performed during the past season, with one single exception, and that had been soon disposed of. Only one case had arisen, when it was necessary to divide a sum of money—some \$800. On a representation being made to the officer, that he (Hon. Mr. Mitchell) would feel it his duty to submit a Bill to Parliament, for the alteration of the law, that officer recognized at once the justice of the proposed change, and said that he would have felt himself bound, under any circumstances, to divide the money among his crew, and that he would therefore leave it in the charge of the department for distribution. The money was accordingly divided equally.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Who was that officer?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL — Commander Lavoie.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—A good officer?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—That officer had performed his duties to the perfect satisfaction of the Department. It should not, however, rest in the power of any officer to divide or keep all the money as he might think proper; and therefore the change in the law was proposed. Before concluding, he could not refrain from referring to the fact that the whole spirit of our legislation in this particular had been commented upon in high quarters in another country as arbitrary and novel. Now, he could say positively that the Act was neither unusual nor arbitrary—it contained those provisions which were found in the revenue laws of the mother country as well as of the neigh-

bouring republic. In no point of view could it be considered objectionable.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Was it without danger?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—With the experience of the past before us, we could say that it involved the country in no danger whatever. On the contrary, the course pursued had evoked respect for the legislation of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST thought the Bill unobjectionable, but his hon. friend had not answered his question which was, whether the Act was not calculated to create danger. He was one of those, he must add, who would sustain any rights which we had, but between might and right there was a great difference.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—No measure was devoid of danger. It must be admitted, however, that so far as he could see, our course had resulted in convincing certain people of the necessity of coming to some amicable arrangement. At all events, respect was evoked for our assertion of the rights of the Dominion. He doubted the policy of hinting that we were afraid there was danger in asserting our rights. Everything said by his hon. friend and others was telegraphed and published in the New York press. He had seen that day in one of the papers of that city, a report of the recent debate in the Senate on the Fishery question. It would, therefore, be seen how careful we should be of everything said at the time when the Commission was meeting at Washington. No remarks should be made to create the impression across the borders that we supposed that there would be any resistance to the just claims which would be brought forward by our representative at Washington.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST wished to know should we allow it to be said elsewhere that Canada was enforcing by additional legislation the same regulations which had led to existing difficulties.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said there was no intention of repealing the existing laws. The leader of the Government had stated elsewhere that the same instructions would be given to the officers the forthcoming season as had been given last year. In order to make the service effective, changes in the law as proposed were required. That fact did not affect our position at all. It did not give the Americans any reason to suppose that we were legislating in an unfriendly spirit. Even if they agreed to come to a fair understanding and give us compensation for certain privileges, it would be necessary that the

law should be in existence and be made as perfect as possible.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST must not be understood to object to the Bill.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to Committee on Tuesday next.

The House then adjourned until Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, March 3, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:10 p.m.

Several petitions were presented.

PRIVATE ACCOUNTS OF MEMBERS.

Before proceeding to business Hon. J. H. CAMERON complained that a practice had grown up, that any member might go to the accountants office and inspect the accounts of other members. It was a liberty that he thought should be checked by the Speaker, or if he did not like to take the responsibility on himself of doing so, then it should be checked by the House.

After a short discussion the SPEAKER said that he was not aware of the practice, but, having heard the opinion of the House he would take care in future that no information should be given to any individual member.

THE BANKING ACT.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved for leave to introduce a Bill relating to Banks and Banking. In making this motion he wished to make a few explanatory remarks with respect to the scope of the Bill. Last year he had the honor to introduce a measure to enable the Governor General to grant new charters to Banks as the old ones expired. It was supposed at the time that many Banks would avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them of having their charters renewed. It had so happened that in only one single instance had a charter been so renewed. Although within the last couple of weeks there had been a number of applications from Banks for the extension of their charters, they almost unanimously expressed themselves in favour of having Parliamentary charters. When this was ascertained—and it was quite recently—Government determined that they would endeavour to embody in one general Act, not only the provisions of the Act of last session, but also the general provisions of what he might term the

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

internal regulations of Banks, which seemed desirable, and which they themselves seemed desirous should be as near as possible assimilated. They wished all to be put on the same footing with respect to these resolutions. Now, he was bound to say that this was as far as Government thought of going with regard to that matter, but within a very few days he had reason to believe, from conversations he had had with gentlemen well versed in such matters, that there was a very general desire that in the Bank Act the charters should be extended for ten years. He would now move for leave to introduce the measure, and after the second reading he would refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where hon. gentlemen of experience in banking matters would have an opportunity to aid in producing a measure that would satisfy all parties.

The Bill was then read a first time, second reading on Friday next.

PREVENTION OF BRIBERY.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS introduced an Act for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of revenue. He explained that under the present law the only penalty for bribing a Revenue officer was a civil suit for the collection of £100. This sum was altogether inadequate, and the Bill he now introduced was to provide that such offences should be punishable as misdemeanors, both the officer bribed and the person corrupting him to be liable to punishment.

Mr. SNIDER moved that Bill No. 22 be discharged, and the motion being carried, introduced a Bill to extend the Act authorizing the imposition and collection of harbor dues, by the town of Owen Sound.

EXPENSES OF THE FENIAN RAID.

The formal message from His Excellency having been read,

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions affirming the expediency of indemnifying the Government for having authorised the issue of a special warrant for \$200,000, to provide for the defence of the Dominion in repelling the Fenian Invasion in the month of May last. He would take occasion to explain with respect to the resolutions of last year, involving the expenditure of money, that he had looked at the Act during recess, and notwithstanding the objection of the hon. member for Chateauguay, he did not find that it was necessary to precede the resolution by a message from His Excellency, still, he was bound to admit that it

was hardly possible in cases of this kind to proceed with too great caution. He had, therefore, adopted the usual formality.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was quite sure that if the Act did not specify the mode of proceeding, the spirit of it was that the form should be observed. Its object was to tie the hands of the House against any unauthorized expenditure. He, therefore, thought that when a large amount was to be expended, and in this case he admitted, necessarily expended, the utmost formality should be observed.

The resolution was read a first time.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of Savings' Banks, and also of the issue and redemption of Dominion notes. In making this motion, he wished to observe that His Excellency had commanded him to inform the House that he (the Governor General) had cognizance of this motion. Before Tuesday the resolutions would be printed in both languages, and in the hands of honourable members.

THE CENSUS ACT.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved the House into Committee on the Bill to amend the Census Act, Hon. Col. GRAY in the chair.

In reply to the Hon. Mr. Holton.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the majority of the enumerators would finish their work in about three weeks from the commencement of the enumeration. There were some few districts with small scattered populations in which the census could not be taken before mid-summer. Of course, the moment the Government should get returns from the greater part of the country, they would commence to compile and count. There would be no delay on the part of the Commissioners. The compilation would be pushed forward with the utmost dispatch, and the work would be completed long before the next meeting of the House.

On reading the eighth clause.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the provisions of this clause empowered the Governor General to render valid anything that should be done under the authority of the Minister of Agriculture. Why have any other provision at all? It did seem to him, in practice and reason and in every point of view as a most *omnium gatherum* kind of provision. He really thought it would save printing and trouble to strike out all the rest of the Bill but this one clause.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said he had explained the object of this clause when he introduced the Bill. The hon. member for Lambton, had expressed his assent to it. The reason was this, in the numerous districts and sub-districts, it was hardly possible to avoid mistakes, and the whole purport of this Bill was to permit the correction of such errors without issuing a new proclamation.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the only objection to it was that serious questions might be involved, which should be dealt with by proclamation in the usual way. He had very great confidence in the hon. gentleman opposite, but the public outside might have a different opinion and he thought it was desirable in this census matter that everything should be done open and above board that the people might see and know what was going on. In Manitoba it was charged that the census had been taken there under local official sanction, and very improperly. Sections where nobody existed were declared as having hundreds of inhabitants, and it was charged directly in newspapers of that country that the census had been falsified. Now, in a case of that kind where the taking of the census was to determine the proportion of representatives of the Province, everything should be done in the most open and frank manner possible. There should be no arming of the hon. gentleman with a law which could be abused.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN assured his hon. friend that the clause did not increase the power of the Government except in the manner he had explained.

The clause was passed and the Bill was reported with amendments.

ASSIMILATION OF CURRENCY.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the House into Committee to consider certain resolutions for the assimilation of the currency throughout the Dominion.

Hon. Col. GRAY in the chair.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he hardly knew that he had any observations to make to the House on this occasion. It seemed to him that the assimilation of the currency had commended itself to the opinion of every hon. member in this House so completely, that it was hardly necessary to say one word with respect to the resolutions which he had introduced. He very much regretted that there was not that entire satisfaction to the measure in the Province of Nova Scotia, which had a different currency from other parts of the Dominion.

He had reason to fear that they were hardly yet reconciled to have the currency assimilated, but the question was not one for the Dominion of Canada alone, but the object was to have an assimilated currency throughout the whole of this continent [hear, hear]. He thought it must be obvious that the time had arrived that this assimilation should be made (hear, hear). It was one of the objects proposed on this occasion to put an end to having British silver any longer a legal tender in the country. He thought it was exceedingly desirable that the only legal tender should be our own coin. It had been found by experience that the British silver was exceedingly inconvenient for circulation and there were fears and with very obvious reasons that a coin which answered very well for a subsidiary coin in the British Islands, but which might not be found to suit our comparatively small population might be thrown upon us in large quantities. It was in itself depreciated and really and truly was no better intrinsically than the coins of the United States, which we had so much trouble in removing, and we must remember that if it ever should circulate in such quantities it would produce exactly the same effects as the American silver did. He thought it, therefore, advisable that an end should be put to that. He believed we had a sufficient quantity of our own silver, and as there was no difficulty in procuring the coin, there was no necessity to resort to the silver of other countries. There was another provision in this Bill respecting gold coins. They would still continue to be legal tenders, and he was bound to say that he could not conceive any circumstances under which it would be advisable, as long as gold coins continued at their present value, that they should cease to be legal tender in this country. The British gold in circulation in this country was under one-tenth of the whole amount; that was to say that for one sovereign in circulation there were nine half eagles. Whether it might be desirable to have Canadian gold coins he could not say at present. However, it was quite premature to discuss at present the advisability of issuing Canadian coins. From enquiries he had made, he had discovered that the banks preferred American half-eagles to British sovereigns, it being found that the sovereigns were not worth as much as the American coin. With regard to copper coinage it was proposed that the bronze cents should be the only legal tender. He proposed that the Act should come into operation on the 1st July, 1871. All existing liabilities would be settled in the currency in which they

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

were contracted, and although, no doubt, some inconvenience would be experienced, he trusted it would be but of short duration. He referred to the time when there had been different currencies in England and Ireland, and said he had a distinct recollection of the dissatisfaction expressed when these currencies were assimilated, but it had soon ended, and he was satisfied that in the case of the Dominion the benefit would soon be experienced, and that Nova Scotians would be amongst those best satisfied with the change.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON considered that the necessity of a uniform currency was self-evident, and thought the resolutions before the House very thoroughly met the requirements of the case. He was glad there would be an entire displacement of British silver, which was a grievance almost as great as the American silver had been. He was not, however, disposed to assent to a gold coinage, as he thought it would prove most costly, and without commensurate advantage. He also thought that the American gold standard was not identical with that of England and consequently the proposed Canadian half-eagle would not be of the exact value of the American half-eagle.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS explained that the difference in fineness would be met by a proportionate difference in weight, so as to make the two coins of exactly the same intrinsic value.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON admitted that the difficulty could in that way be obviated, but maintained that the wording of the resolutions did not admit of such being done. He thought that the effect of the 6th clause was to confirm the action of the Government in issuing silver coins, for which he was inclined to think, there was no authority in Law.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Plenty of authority.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was aware that there were Acts in the old Province, but did not remember any Bill since the 1st July 1867. He did not object, but merely pointed out the effect of the clause.

On the whole he approved of the resolutions.

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings, N. S.) moved in amendment that all after the word "expedient" should be struck out, and that the following should be substituted, "that the currency of Nova Scotia should remain unchanged, and should not be assimilated to that of the United States." He feared that the Finance Minister and the leader of the Opposition being in accord in the matter, Nova Scotia would, with its small representation go to the

wall, unless the House accorded them that generosity to which they had a right. He pointed out the Nova Scotia currency was based on the decimal system, the English sovereign passing for \$5, and the English shilling for 25 cents, and urged that any change made by the Dominion Parliament would create very great dissatisfaction. He then read a resolution of the Nova Scotia Assembly opposing any change in the currency except on an International basis and claimed for it the respect and consideration of the House as representing the opinion of the people of Nova Scotia at large. He considered it his duty thus to bring the matter before the House, and should demand a vote on his amendment. He further objected to the time proposed for the coming into operation of the measure, on the ground that throughout Nova Scotia all mercantile accounts were closed on the 1st January, and urged therefore that in order to have as little confusion and inconvenience as possible, the time should be the 1st of January. He concluded by asking that Nova Scotia should receive at the hands of the Government the same considerations that had been extended to it on former occasions, and that the measure should at least be postponed until another session.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY thought it was quite clear that the member for King's was a young member of that House, or he would not have asked consideration for Nova Scotia on account of its small representation, for no one could question that the interests of Nova Scotia had ever been treated with the greatest consideration. The assimilation of the currency had been one of the advantages that was expected to result specially from Confederation, and it had simply been postponed hitherto on account of the representations of members from Nova Scotia, who, session after session, had urged that no change should take place while there was the least prospect of an international currency, but now that that prospect was so entirely done away with there could be no possible reason for further postponement. As far as New Brunswick was concerned, he did not hesitate to say that the prospect of this assimilation had been one of the strongest reasons for agreeing to Confederation, and he was confident that in a very short time after the change had been effected Nova Scotia would be as much pleased as any other portion of the Dominion. He detailed the many difficulties and the great inconvenience experienced throughout Nova Scotia in all matters of Customs and Excise, and in fact in every transaction between business men and any of the public offices. As to the

time at which the change should take place, he pointed out the great importance of its taking effect from the beginning of the financial year, the 1st July, as otherwise one half-year of the public accounts would be under a different system to the other, and if the Finance Minister could be prepared to introduce a sufficient supply of the new silver coinage into Nova Scotia at the commencement of the Act, he anticipated very little inconvenience. He instanced the great inconvenience and loss a merchant from Ontario or Quebec would sustain, if, after collecting accounts in Nova Scotia and returning home, he found the amount of notes he had received nominally correct, but in reality 3 or 4 per cent. below their value from being payable at Halifax, and he could state positively that great loss had been experienced in New Brunswick in that way, and there could be no possible reason for allowing such a state of things to continue—notwithstanding the resolution of the Assembly of Nova Scotia that had been read, he knew that there existed a great division of opinion in that Province on the subject, and he read an extract from a letter from Mr. John R. Ryerson of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia urging the assimilation of the Currency and urging also that that assimilation should come into effect as soon as possible. As to losses which it was anticipated might result on contracts entered into previous to the change, he mentioned that a gentleman in Nova Scotia, who was acknowledged to have devoted more time and attention to the subject than any other in the Province, Mr. Jack, had published an article some years previously, for the purpose of urging the Dominion to accept the currency of Nova Scotia, in which he showed that though there might be inconvenience there need be neither gain nor loss. He read an extract from the article. He trusted not only that the principle of the measure would be accepted by the House, but that no postponement would take place in the date on which it was to take effect.

Mr. McDONALD—(Lunenburg)—When this question had been previously discussed he had considered it his duty to oppose it as unjust to Nova Scotia, so long as there was any possibility of an international currency, but from the moment that project ceased to be a possibility, he made up his mind that there was no further reason for opposing an assimilation of the currency of the Dominion. He had always regarded that assimilation as inevitable in one way or another, and while, as a Nova Scotian, regretting the inconvenience to which his Province would be subjected, he was compelled to admit that it would be unfair to subject the other

three Provinces to the inconvenience of changing their currency to that of Nova Scotia, and he fully admitted that opinion was by no means unanimous on the question in Nova Scotia. As to the time, he thought it a matter open to discussion, but the assimilation he regarded as inevitable.

Hon. Mr. HOWE had listened with very great pleasure to the maiden speech of the member for Kings, and was only sorry that he had to oppose him, but the question was now before them in such a way that it could not be withstood, and with regard to one particular remark of the member for Kings he could not help saying that though the representatives of Nova Scotia were in a minority, they had invariably received the greatest consideration. The question had been staved off time after time in the hope of an international currency, but such a hope was now at an end, and as gentlemen he thought Nova Scotia members could not ask the majority of the House further to postpone the matter. He referred to the establishment of the present Nova Scotia currency by the present Chief Justice, Sir William Young, recalling how he (Mr. Howe) had urged, though, in vain, that that currency should be the same as that in use on the remainder of the continent. He admitted that in their transactions with England, Nova Scotians found their currency most convenient, but maintained that in other transactions it was most inconvenient. He was sure ample provisions had been made to avoid all loss on dealings commenced before the change, and though inconvenience and even dissatisfaction might arise, the question would have to come sometime, and it might just as well come now.

Mr. OLIVER feared that when the English silver and the twenty cent pieces were withdrawn from circulation there would be a great scarcity of silver, and now that the banks were prohibited from issuing smaller notes than \$4, the small notes would naturally be withheld and consequently there would be a greater demand for silver, and he would press this matter on the attention of the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS assured the hon. member for North Oxford, that he had been constantly considering the question, as he had felt that it would be most disadvantageous to have either too much or too little silver. He thought, however, that no one had a better opportunity of knowing the exact state of affairs than he had, and he well understood that the withdrawal of twenty cent pieces and British silver would neces-

sitate a greater quantity of Canadian silver, but he stated that the difficulties in obtaining supplies of the new coinage experienced in the first instance were now obviated, and that fresh supplies could be obtained on a very short notice. As to the time at which the new measure should take effect, he found it would be very difficult to ascertain how much of the new coinage, either gold or silver, would be required when that time came, and he therefore considered it most important that it should be at a time of the year when fresh supplies could be obtained with the least possible delay and expense.

Mr. CHIPMAN then agreed to withdraw his amendment, on the understanding that he would move it again when the resolutions came up for concurrence.

Mr. GIBBS (South Ontario) said that two of the chief benefits that had been promised from Confederation were the encouragement of commercial intercourse between the Provinces, and the assimilation of the currency. The one had been accomplished, and the other had only been deferred in consideration for the Province of Nova Scotia. The necessity for assimilation was universally conceded, and needed no argument. He thought that in return for the consideration shown to Nova Scotia in the repeated postponements of the matter they ought to withhold all opposition and allow the measure to pass unanimously. The question was whether the larger should yield to the smaller, or the smaller to the larger. There might be a little difficulty, but it would very soon be overcome and the Nova Scotians would soon find that the change was most beneficial.

Mr. SAVARY was just as much in favor of the Nova Scotian currency as any one could be, and had urged his views session after session, but felt that the House was so decided in the matter that it would be useless to oppose the resolution. He thought the true question was which was the best currency, and although he felt strongly in the matter, he would not repeat his opinions as he knew it would be useless. Referring to the question of an International currency, he stated that the project had fallen through, not because of the unhappy position of France and other European countries, but because the American Government had refused to accede to the recommendations of the Paris conference. He should certainly support the amendment of the member for Kings, but that failing he should not further oppose the measure, as he thought the anomaly of the Dominion having different currencies should not exist any longer.

Mr. McDonald.

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings) said he thought he had heard the hon. member for Hants say that no *Gentleman* could oppose the measure (laughter), but trusted he had misunderstood him. In reply to the member for Oshawa he thought the question was not whether "the larger should yield to the smaller, nor the smaller to the larger" but which was the best currency, and as the Nova Scotia currency was based on the British coinage, He certainly thought it more patriotic [cheers and laughter] for those who believed in British connection to pay homage to their *Sovereign* (renewed laughter.) When the resolutions came up for concurrence he should endeavor to address himself directly to the point, and test the sense of the House.

The 1st, 2nd and 3rd clauses were then passed.

In reply to Mr. Killam's question on the 4th resolution,

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS stated that every security would be given as regards the notes, gold and silver coin. With regard to the standard of fineness for their gold coin, they could not use the Mint of the United States, though, on the ground of the desirability of uniformity, he would prefer their standard. Having to go to the Royal Mint, the English standard of fineness would have to be chosen. But the Canadian coin, though not of the same standard as that of the Republic, would be of the same value; of that there need be no doubt or fear.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN hoped the Finance Minister would hesitate long before resorting to an issue of a gold coin currency, though he might take power in the Bill therefor. In the settlement of foreign exchanges it would be of less value than American or English coin, however equal to either nation's coin it might be in Canada. Besides, we did not want a new coinage, having all the coin we needed at present.

The 5th and remaining resolutions were passed, and the Committee rose. The report to be received on Tuesday next.

Mr. COSTIGAN inquired whether the Ordnance Lands in New Brunswick had been transferred by the Imperial Government; if so, do they intend to dispose of them, and under what system. If no such transfer has yet been made, is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to obtain such transfer?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was understood to reply that a certain portion of the Ordnance Lands in New Brunswick were transferred to the Government of Canada—a portion of them in the vicinity of Fredericton. As to the remainder, the

matter had not yet engaged the attention of the Government, but would soon.

There being no other orders on the paper ready to proceed with, the motion for an adjournment till Monday was carried, at a few minutes to six.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, 6th March, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Hon. Messrs. Ryan, Skead, and Wilmot, presented petitions.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. WARK moved that "a select committee be appointed to enquire into, and report on all matters connected with the survey, location, and construction of the Intercolonial Railway, since the appointment of the Commissioners, with power to send for persons and papers, and that the said Committee be composed of the Honourable Sir Edward Kenny, and the hon. Messrs. Aikins, Burnham, Letellier de St. Just, Locke, Price, Wilmot, and the mover, to meet and adjourn as they please." In making his motion, the hon. gentleman said that it was not necessary that he should make any lengthy remarks on the subject. It was evident that there should be a very careful investigation into all matters connected with the construction of so important a public work as the Intercolonial Railway, involving the expenditure of large sums of public money. The committee, last session, had little time for making all the enquiries they wished. The Commissioners complained that they had not sufficient opportunity afforded them to give explanations, which might have led to some modifications of the report. Under all the circumstances, it was very desirable that a Committee should be appointed to enquire into the whole question.

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER'S name was substituted for that of Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just, on motion of the latter.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL had no objection to the Committee—as the Government were desirous that the fullest investigation should be made into so important a question. He suggested that the names of Hon. Messrs. Mitchell and Ferrier be added to the Committee, instead of substituted for two other gentlemen as the hon. mover proposed.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER desired, before the motion passed, to take an opportunity of

saying a few words respecting the progress which was being made in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Complaints had arisen that the work was not advancing as fast as it ought to be—that the staff generally employed was too large and consequently too much expense incurred. As respects the progress of the work, he believed it was but slow, though he was not prepared to state the causes of the delay. It was a well known fact that contracts had been awarded to parties who were notable to fulfil them. It ought certainly to have been apparent to the Commissioners and the large staff of engineers that the work could not have been executed for so low a price as was tendered for by some parties. When the contractors gave up the work the next parties who took it had, in some cases, double what had been given in the first instance. He wished to know from the Commissioners whether any proceedings had been taken against the securities for the execution of the contracts which had been forfeited. It was not with a view of giving an opinion that there should be a prosecution against the parties that he made these remarks—he believed it was generally understood that it was better to leave those securities alone. Proceedings had been taken in some cases, and the consequence had been that the Government finally had to pay the expenses. As respects the part with which he was best acquainted, he knew, as a fact, that if the works there were progressing with more rapidity it would give a chance to the other contractors in the interior to execute their works 25 or 30 per cent. less than they could do so now; for then they would be in a better position to obtain their supplies and materials. He did not understand why the works should not be constructed in a shorter time. It was not surprising, however, that delays should occur when some of the contractors left the most difficult part of the work to the last. The deep excavations, for instance in which only a limited number of men could be put at a time. It had also been complained that the staff of officers employed was too large in proportion to the work to be done. It was true that the Commissioners were properly appointed at the beginning of the work, but he was not prepared to say they were necessary at the close. It was not advisable to have an *imperium in imperio*. He did not say that any of the gentlemen would be influenced by personal interests, but it might be argued by some that they would not be inclined to press the completion of the work as earnestly as desirable.

Hon Mr. McLELAN replied that since
Hon. Mr. Tessier.

he had the honour of a seat on the Commission, the question of the staff had been under the consideration of the Commissioners and the Government, and at the commencement of 1871 a very large reduction had actually been made, and a considerable saving of expense thereby effected. The Commissioners had always been anxious to bring down the expenses to the lowest point commensurate with the public interests. The hon. gentlemen would bear in mind that the Intercolonial Railway was a long road, and that a large part of it ran through an uncultivated country where the expense of surveying was very considerable compared with what it would be through a settled district; but, nevertheless, he was satisfied that when comparison with other roads was made, the expenses of the Intercolonial in this particular would not be found greater. Any one who knew anything of railways was aware that the most important part of the work was the survey. He had reason to know that although a long period of time had passed in the survey, it had effected very considerable savings in the construction of the road. As respects the end of the line referred to by the hon. gentleman, the Messrs. Worthington had been employed on it from the commencement. Near Trois Pistoles, the contractors were working as many men as was possible, but only a certain number could be employed in the cutting, which was of clay and very difficult. He thought nearly the whole of that contract in that section of the country had been completed with the exception of that particular cutting. In respect to what had been done in Nova Scotia, he could give a satisfactory answer. It had been already stated by the Postmaster General that the 70 or 80 miles of railway there would be opened by the end of the present year; but there were on that line also some troublesome clay and rock cuttings. Last summer some forty miles were relet, and the work commenced in the early part of the summer. Two millions of yards of earth had been taken out of that section; 150,000 yards of rock excavated, and 70 or 80 structures of masonry constructed. The work was progressing as rapidly as it was possible under the circumstances. The Commissioners had no desire other than to court the fullest investigation into everything connected with the road. He hoped that the chairman of the Committee would allow the Commissioners to see the report before submitting it to the House. Last year, the Commissioners did not see it at all, and they had reason to believe that it contained statements which could

have been easily explained away had they had the opportunity of doing so.

Hon. Mr. WARK was not prepared to admit that any report of a Committee of that House should be submitted to a Commission whose conduct it arraigned. He admitted, however, that the Commissioners should have a full hearing respecting every matter which might be taken up by the Committee. Last year, all the members of the Committee were regularly summoned to attend, and the report was delayed until the last moment when it could be submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN referred to one fact which showed how necessary it was that the Commissioners should have every opportunity for giving explanations. A discrepancy existed between the report of the Engineers and the report of the Committee of last Session, with respect to the number of staff employed. The hon. gentleman had asked for a return of all the persons who were employed on the different sections of the work during the year. Now it happened that when an engineer finished his work on one section, he was sent off to another. So the same engineer might be mentioned a dozen times during the year. The hon. gentleman, however, was ignorant of that fact and counted one engineer half a dozen times in more than one instance, and thereby made the number of the staff appear larger than it actually was.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT could bear testimony to the anxiety of his hon. friend (hon. Mr. Wark) to get all the members of the Committee together during last session, and obtain all the information bearing upon the question under review. It certainly appeared that the investigation was beneficial, for there had already been made a reduction in the staff. No man who served on the Committee could shut his eyes to the fact that there were very extravagant expenditures in connection with the prosecution of the work. Any one with experience of business knew that supplies were charged at far higher rates than they were bought for elsewhere. It was also obvious that the staff employed was far beyond what was required.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN replied that the Commissioners were prepared to show that from the very inception of the work they had endeavoured to keep the expenses within the smallest possible limits. At the first hour that the chief engineer considered a reduction was practicable, the Commissioners made it and saved a considerable expense.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Was there not a reduction of wages in consequence of that report?

Hon. Mr. McLELAN—The instructions from the first to the paymasters and engineers were not to pay more than the ordinary wages of the country. When the pay rolls came over to the head office, it was observed that the wages paid some of the men were larger than the usual wages, and enquiry was accordingly made into the subject. The answer was that those men were required to work during all weathers, and it was only with the greatest difficulty they could be got to remain in the service.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL referred to the terms of the Act under which the contracts were given out to show that there was no other alternative open to the Commissioners than to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, providing the Commissioners were satisfied that he was able to carry on the work. The Commissioners were not in a position to deal with the work as they would have been if it had been a private undertaking. If under these circumstances any arbitrary determination had been come to by the Commissioners, and the lowest tender had not been taken, it would have been impossible to justify their course before Parliament. They arrived at the conclusion, in many cases, that the resources of the lowest tenderer were not adequate to the performance of the work, and it was accordingly re-advertised and the lowest tender again accepted. In some cases the rule had worked satisfactorily; in other cases the reverse was the fact; at all events no other could have been adopted by the Commissioners.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER asked whether any of the sections now given out would have to be re-advertised and relet, and added that his desire in making the enquires he had, was to elicit the true facts respecting an important public work, and not to bring a charge against the Commissioners. It was his belief that the Committee now asked for would do good.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government had no information that enabled them to answer the question of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said that one of the Engineers was now going over the entire line—having commenced in Nova Scotia—and would be here in a few days. What his report might be it was of course impossible to say, but at present the Commissioners had no information leading them to suppose that any of the sections would have to be relet.

The motion as amended, then passed.

THE LACHINE REGATTA.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU put the following enquiry to the Government:—

Whether the Government of the Dominion gave instructions (and if so, by what authority?) to the Trinity House of Montreal, to prohibit and prevent the erection of platforms on the banks of the St. Lawrence, at Lachine, on the occasion of the regatta which took place in or about the month of September last at Lachine?

2nd. Whether the Government of the Dominion authorized or required the Montreal Water Police to arrest peaceable persons employed in erecting such platforms, and that without warrants?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that the Government of the Dominion gave no instructions to the Trinity House of Montreal to prohibit or prevent the erection of the platforms in question. Neither did the Government authorize or require the Montreal Water Police to arrest peaceable persons employed in erecting those platforms.

POST OFFICE AT RIVIERE OUELLE.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST moved that an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a copy of the letter of resignation of Louis Frenette, Esquire, Postmaster at Rivière Ouelle, with copies of correspondence on the subject, and also copies of all papers and recommendations touching the nomination of his successor. In making the motion, he said he must express his surprise that several weeks had passed away, since a letter influentially signed by the inhabitants of the Parish had been sent to the Government asking them to make the appointment. A member of the House must certainly have very little influence when his recommendation for an appointment to a paltry office valued at only some forty or fifty dollars a year was not worth considering. He did not expect any favours from the Government, but he was certainly surprised that the memorial was not yet answered. He knew, however, where the difficulty arose—a gentleman in the Government could tell all about it.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS was not at all surprised at the references that had been made by the hon. gentleman, and would endeavour to explain the whole matter as it really stood. The office might be paltry,

Hon. Mr. Bureau.

but to fill it up involved a principle. The Postmaster of River Ouelle was sick and unable to attend to his duties. If he was rightly informed, that officer, sometime in the latter part of December last, thought proper to appoint a deputy, who had taken the post office under his own control and kept it at his own residence. Those preliminary steps were taken without the knowledge or assent of his hon. colleague, the Postmaster General. The whole month of January elapsed and the post office remained in the same position. In the month of February the postmaster did not think proper to keep his deputy any longer, but sent in his resignation. He gave his resignation to his deputy with instructions to forward it to the Department. In the meantime, however, the deputy made an application to have the post office, and eventually a kind of petition was got up in favour of that gentleman. About the same time all that was going on, another gentleman addressed him (Mr. Chapais) stating that the Postmaster was about to resign, and asking him to support his application. He replied in the affirmative, as he considered the gentleman quite competent for the office, and felt he himself ought to have something to say with respect to the appointment. He stated verbally to the Postmaster General that if the Postmaster resigned he would recommend somebody, and his hon. colleague expressed himself satisfied. At the beginning of the session his hon. friend sent him some papers, among which was a certificate in favour of the gentleman previously mentioned, and the resignation of the Postmaster. The Postmaster General had asked him what he would do, and he replied that he was taken by surprise, and wanted a little time to consider the matter. That was a plain statement of the facts as far as he knew them, and under the circumstances he thought it was allowable for him to take a little time to reflect on the whole subject. When all the papers were before the House it would be seen why he did not wish to act hastily. He did not wish to bring any names forward. Those who understood his relations to the parties in the affair would appreciate his conduct in that respect. He contended that, as a member of the Government, he was entitled to give his opinion respecting the appointments made by the Government. He was well known in Kamouraska—he had represented it for many years, and would do so now, had not certain occurrences taken place to which he did not wish to refer at that juncture. He had a perfect right to interest himself in the affairs of Kamouraska and intended to

do so, whatever other gentlemen might say to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER said he had listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, but he had been unable to discover the principle to which that hon. gentleman referred in the commencement of his speech. He did hope that gentlemen on both sides would keep cool on a matter of such importance. (Laughter.) It was certainly the first time that he had heard of such a valuable office being vacant. He had thought that the principle of "Parish Politics" had long before been laid aside by the gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches. An hon. gentleman had once referred to what he was pleased to call the parish politics of the Maritime Provinces; but whatever reason there was in that memorable expression of that hon. gentleman, there appeared to be no doubt now that those politics had got to Rivière Ouelle; and now, who could venture to say, that they might not spread elsewhere (continued laughter,) and produce an injurious effect upon public affairs.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST replied that notwithstanding the felicitous remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken he must again refer to the question before the House. The Postmaster had given proper securities and was responsible for the deputy he appointed. That deputy had kept the office in a place most convenient to the community. He (Mr. Letellier) did not expect that his advice would be taken, but certainly the requests of the people should be heard. It was assuredly a just cause for complaint that three weeks had passed away and still the matter was not settled.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS said that if the post office did not remain where it is now, it would not go far off, and the public interests would not suffer.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the Government, in such cases, usually consulted their friends. He was now making the necessary enquiries, and hoped soon to submit a name to His Excellency for the appointment in question.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that it was quite proper that the hon. gentleman should make enquiries through his friends, but he did not want it to go to the country that the Postmaster General would give offices to his friends even when on investigation he should find there were others more competent to fill them. He had always been in opposition, since he had been in public life, but he could not say that the Postmaster General had been accustomed to pass him over in respect to arranging postal matters

in the locality in which he was interested. He trusted that the gentleman who now filled the office would not depart from that excellent practice which his predecessors had followed. An instance had occurred, in his own knowledge, where a person had been appointed to a post office, of a place of some importance, despite the fact that he was notoriously obnoxious to the majority of the people. For these reasons, he must enter his protest against the doctrine laid down in such sweeping terms by the Postmaster General.

The motion then passed.

THE ARBITRATION.

The motion respecting the Arbitration between Ontario and Quebec, (Hon. Mr. Letellier De St. Just) was deferred until Thursday. The papers not being yet printed.

MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a Bill to extend the Criminal Law to Manitoba.

Read a first time; second reading on Thursday next.

THE NORTH WEST TERRITORY.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL, in moving the second reading of the Bill in reference to the North West Territories, stated that it was intended to make provision for the government of the North West Territories. At the time the original Act was passed, it included Manitoba, but by the legislation of last session that section was incorporated into a distinct Province, and the Act of the previous session was continued until the termination of the present. The present Bill professed to make the provisions of the Act of 1869 permanent as regards the rest of the Territory outside of Manitoba. The same object would be effected by simply continuing the Act of 1869, but it was thought preferable by the Law Clerk to re-enact the provisions of the Act. That might be more convenient, inasmuch as the Act for the government of the North West Territory would then be given *in extenso*.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole on the following day.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, March 6th, 1871

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:20 p.m. Several petitions were presented.

NEW BILLS.

Mr. HARRISON introduced a Bill to remove doubts as to Premium notes taken or held by Insurance Companies. In reply to Hon. Mr. Holton, he explained that under the present Act, notes taken under some circumstances by Insurance Companies, were not stamped. In the Bill, he now introduced, he proposed that all notes should be stamped.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked if it was not beyond the province of the hon. member to introduce such a measure by which it was proposed to impose taxation.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON was of opinion that the Bill should be introduced by the Government.

Mr. HARRISON said the Bill he now introduced was to enable those who had been mistaken in the construction of the present Act, to put themselves right, not to impose any duty.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT believed the Government should deal with all such measures. This was the first case of which he was aware in which a private member proposed to legislate on fiscal regulations.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the bill must first be introduced by resolutions.

Mr. HARRISON said the principal object of the bill was to render valid, securities which were now invalid. On two former occasions he had introduced similar measures which were referred to special committees. The general law as it now stood imposed a tax, and the bill before the House was simply to enable those who had mistaken the nature of that bill to correct their errors.

After some discussion,

The SPEAKER said there was nothing in the bill to induce him to rule it out of order.

The bill was read a first time.

A MISUNDERSTANDING CORRECTED.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS presented a return of the number and names of the employees connected with the Finance Department. He remarked at the same time that none of these gentlemen had been employed in the arbitration question. The cause of the statement that had been made this:—In the time of his predecessor, experienced men were required by the Local Governments. Four gentlemen connected with the Finance Department were employed, and for their services received some small remuneration, but they had nothing to do with the arbitration question.

Mr. Harrison.

THE ESTIMATES.

A message from His Excellency, submitting a portion of the estimates for 1872, to the House, was read.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, in reply to Sir A. T. Galt, said returns of expenditures for the current year to as late a date as possible would be laid before the House to-morrow.

In reply to Hon. Mr. Holton, Sir Francis Hincks said it was not his intention to make the Financial statement to-morrow. He would simply move the House into Committee of Supply and pass a few items, to which no objection could be made. The financial statement would be made on Friday.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. MACFARLANE asked whether it is the intention of the Government to reimburse Postmasters paid by percentage the deficiency in the emoluments of their offices occasioned by the decreased postal rates created by 31 Vict., cap. 10, so that the revenues received by them from such offices (since the establishment of such rates) may be repleted to make up an annual income equal to that received by them previous to the passage of said Act; and also whether any promise or suggestion was at any time made by the Postmaster General to any such officers that such would be done?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied that although there had been a considerable falling off in the post office receipts at the time the reduction of postal rates was made, the receipts were increasing. When the change had been made, the percentage of Postmasters was increased. He assured his hon. friends that the Postmasters did not suffer in any way from the decreased postal rates.

RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN asked whether the officers appointed by Government to make surveys of the Rivers St. John and Medawaska, with a view of improving the navigation of the same, have yet reported thereon, and if so, what action the Government intend taking in the matter?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the officers appointed by Government to make surveys on the River St. John and the Medawaska had reported thereon, and the report showed that these surveys were very extensive. The hon. member could not expect him now to give a resume of the whole report, but he had no doubt if the hon. member would move at a future day for the production of the report it

would be given, and the hon. member would find that it was a very interesting and important document. Several suggestions were made in it by the engineer, and the hon. member would see by the estimates that Government intended to meet them. The hon. gentleman would also see that since the survey had been ordered events had occurred which would render certain changes necessary. New railways, to which large land grants had been made, were to be constructed, which might change the plans of the Government altogether in that direction.

A PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE UNION.

Hon. Mr. SMITH asked whether the Government have had any correspondence with the Local Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick on the subject of a Legislative Union of those two Provinces, which it is so desirable to accomplish?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the Government had had no correspondence about such a legislative union. But if the hon. member would like to hear his (Hon. Sir George's) private opinion in addition to the Ministerial answer, he would tell him that he would like that some such correspondence should take place and that the scheme would include Prince Edward's Island also (hear, hear).

Mr. BOWMAN asked whether it is the intention of the Government to revise the Customs Tariff during the present Session, and if so, whether they intend to place "Vegetable Ivory Nut" on the free list?

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—The hon. member will have to wait for an answer.

THE RED RIVER EXPEDITION.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) moved for copies of all orders in Council relative to the Red River Expedition with copies of correspondence between the Dominion Government and Colonel Wolsley.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the Government would gladly comply with the request of the hon. member as far as possible, but he would inform the hon. gentleman that there was no correspondence with Col. Wolsley to be produced. When the two Canadian battalions were organized they were handed over to the charge of Gen. Lindsay, who appointed Col. Wolsley as their commander. All the correspondence from that time forward was with General Lindsay, and he suggested that the hon. member should amend his motion by substituting that officer's name for Col. Wolsley's.

The motion was accordingly amended and carried.

MR. MOYLAN, EMIGRATION AGENT.

In the absence of Hon. Mr. McConnell, who had given notice of the motion,

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL moved an address for copies of instructions to Mr. J. G. Moylan, Emigrant Agent for the Dominion Government in Ireland, and of all correspondence respecting the letters written by Mr. Moylan, condemning the action of the Imperial Government in the release of Fenians, adding to it, copies of all correspondence respecting the attack made by Mr. Moylan, through the press on Dr. Ryerson, Superintendent of Education. He said—It appears that this gentleman, Mr. Moylan, who was formerly connected with the press in this country, has been selected and sent to Europe by the Dominion Government for the purpose of inducing emigration, and that, following the profession, to which he had been accustomed he has been a very voluminous writer since his arrival on the other side of the Atlantic. His letters have appeared in the public press, covering a very wide field, and he had dated them from "The Canadian Government Emigration office, Dublin." In a letter addressed to Mr. Gladstone on the subject of the action taken by the Imperial Government in the proposed release of the Fenian prisoners then confined in Ireland, he undertook to express his opinion of the policy of the Imperial Government and of the effect of that policy in Canada, and also to express his view of what those who employed him would and did think of that policy. He spoke with an air of authority stating that the Dominion and its Government would be slow to appreciate the action of the Imperial Government in the matter, and that Her Majesty's Government were exposing to great risk the people of Canada in allowing those Fenians to come into their neighbourhood without being permitted to cross our boundary and that in so doing they showed but little feeling for the Canadians. He also desired to call the attention of the House to another matter which perhaps would be more directly interesting to them. He thought it was generally presumed that when agents were selected, and sent to foreign countries in order to make known the merits of Canada, they should at least present the advantages offered to emigrants in the most favorable aspect consistent with the truth; but Mr. Moylan seemed to have taken a different view his duty, and on one occasion when writing of the educational system of Upper Canada, he expressed great regret at being compelled to state that the gentleman at the head of that institution was a Methodist Minister, and that he used his posi-

tion to benefit the body to which he belonged. The letter containing this statement was published in the *Irish Times*, and was also headed from the "Canadian Emigration Office." With reference to this charge the Chief Superintendent of Education, had thought it his duty to contradict it directly and pointedly, stating that during the twenty-seven years during which he had had charge of the Educational Department not a single instance of proselytising had occurred, that on a previous occasion when Mr. Moylan had made a similar statement in Canada, in a newspaper with which he was then connected, he had been challenged to name such an instance, and had been unable to do so, and that therefore he had stated what he knew to be untrue, and further that he had made a false statement with regard to the whole system of education. Mr. McDougall then read a statement prepared by Mr. Ryerson, showing that there were in the schools, which Mr. Moylan had represented to be entirely Protestant, 327 Roman Catholic teachers, and that out of the 246 worn out teachers, who were receiving pensions, the larger number were Roman Catholics, and also showing that as regards religions the whole system was thoroughly impartial. He thought that to say the least it was unfortunate that anyone acting under the official sanction of, and paid by the Dominion Government, should go to any country and so misrepresent—should so falsify the facts connected with Canadian institutions.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the hon. gentleman was very fond indeed of hitting at the Government, he thought he was correct in saying that the present was not the first occasion on which he had hit at actions of the Government of which he himself had been a member. The hon. gentleman desired very much to see the instructions given to Mr. Moylan, but he (Mr. Dunkin) thought he knew as much about them as any one, for Mr. Moylan had been appointed in August 1869, when the hon. gentleman was himself a member of the Government, and as such responsible for the appointment, and though he did not remember the precise time at which Mr. Moylan had received his instructions, he believed they had issued at a time when the hon. gentleman was a member of the Government and also when he was acting as such. He thought it was not the first time the hon. Gentleman had thrown a Boomerang, without taking into consideration the effect of the recoil, but he had no hesitation in saying that there would not be the slightest objection to the production of the papers. He thought Mr. Moylan was sufficiently well known in this country to render needless any

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

defence of his general fitness for the position he occupied. With regard to the indiscreet letters he had written, although he (Mr. Dunkin) had no official knowledge of them, he had thought it his duty to address a quiet letter to Mr. Moylan, which would be produced with the other papers in which he had instructed him not to be guilty of any similar indiscretions in future. The gravamen of the charge seemed to be that the productions had appeared under an official heading. With regard to the portion of the motion added by the hon. member for North Lanark, although he had no objection to the addition, he wished to say that as there had been no notice of the matter, he had not thought it necessary to read the letters referred to, as they had never come before him officially.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that the hon. gentleman who had just addressed the House in common with the other members of the Government, seemed to imagine that the kind of retort used justified them, and very much damaged him. With respect to his responsibility for Acts of an Administration of which he had been a member, he knew how much to share and how much to decline, and he would say that it certainly did not lie in the mouth of the hon. Gentleman who had spoken or in those of his colleagues to take that line of argument. With respect to the particular motion before the House, he had moved it simply in the absence of an hon. member who had been stricken down with illness, still he fully agreed in the object of the motion, and he did not entertain any apprehension as to the effect which would be produced on the Government or himself, by the production of the instructions for which he had asked. On the contrary, he was anxious that they be supplied, as if they had been drawn up during the time he had been in the Government he was confident they contained no instructions to correspond with Ministers of State in England, attacking them for their policy, or to take any of the other objectionable proceedings adopted by Mr. Moylan. The hon. gentlemen opposite had not thought it inconsistent with their duty or beneath their dignity to disavow all responsibility for Acts of Administration, which had occurred while he was a member of the Government, or to endeavour to place on his shoulders the whole responsibility of those Acts. He might mention many instances, but he would confine himself to one, in which a pamphlet acknowledged by a Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Finance, had been distributed, probably at the public expense, in which it had been stated, with reference to the surveys

ordered in the North West, that the course taken by Colonel Dennis acting on instructions given him, were the most imprudent that could have been adopted, and could only be ascribed to infatuation. And when hon. gentlemen could take so mean, so despicable, so unworthy a course as to disavow their responsibility for Acts of an Administration with which he had been connected, for the purpose of gaining the applause of their friends, and avoiding the censure of their enemies, he thought they had better not charge him with any share of responsibility in the matter in question. He repeated, however, that so far as the first instructions were concerned, he was in no way apprehensive, as to their containing anything wrong. The gravamen of the charge was that Mr. Moylan, speaking in the name of the Government, and as if authorised to do so, had made a number of statements that were utterly false, and he wished to ascertain whether the Government had ordered his instant dismissal, and if not he charged them with the responsibility of the letters that had been written, and of the attack on the educational system of Upper Canada, and with all the evil consequences that might occur.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN was very glad that the hon. gentleman had in some degree felt the answer that had been made, and this was fully shown by his falling back on two lines of defence, neither of which, however, would hold. He had had to say that the motion did not originate with him, but when a gentleman took up any motion, he (Mr. Dunkin) thought he made himself answerable for it. In his opening speech the hon. gentleman had spoken of Mr. Moylan's indiscretions as being of course consequent on the instructions sent him, and when reminded that the instructions had been given partly by himself, he changed his mind and said they were no doubt perfectly right. He congratulated his hon. friend on having, for once, attacked, where he had no right to attack.

FISHERIES.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) moved an address for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Admiral Wellesley in regard to protection of Fisheries, mentioning certain rumours that were afloat on the subject, and saying that he believed an insult had been offered to the Government by Admiral Wellesley, and he desired to ascertain the truth of the matter.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said there would not be the slightest objection to bringing down the correspondence asked for, but

that with reference to the concluding remarks of the member for Soulanges, he might say that it would be found that the Government had no reason whatever to complain of Admiral Wellesley, who had given every possible assistance in carrying out the wishes of the Dominion Government. The bulk of the correspondence had already been brought down, but if there was anything further that would throw any light on the subject it would be produced.

The motion was carried.

NORTH WEST EXPEDITION.

Mr. McCALLUM (Monck) moved an address for a statement of vessels chartered for transportation of men and material in the Expedition to the North West Territory, in 1870, together with particulars of their tonnage, nationality, time employed, and amount paid for each per day.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER suggested that the mover should add to his motion a request for similar particulars of vessels chartered by the Imperial Government, a portion of the expense of which the Canadian Government would of course have to bear, as the Expedition had been under the command of General Lindsey.

Mr. McCALLUM (Monck) said that he had no objection to amend his motion as suggested, although he merely desired information as far as the Canadian Government was concerned, and stated that there were many rumours as to there having been much mismanagement in the matter, and as to many American vessels being employed at a large expense when Canadian vessels ought to have been employed, and he desired to ascertain the correctness of that rumour.

Motion was then carried, amended as suggested.

ARBITRATION.

Hon. Mr. DORION then moved, that the House should go into Committee of the Whole, to take into consideration certain resolutions on the subject of the division between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario of the surplus of the debt of the former Province of Canada. It was well known to the House that the Union Act contained a provision, that out of the whole debt of Canada, \$62,500,000 should be assumed by the Dominion, and that the balance should be divided between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, in such a way as might be determined by Arbitration. After three and a half years an award had been obtained, which, however, in his opinion, decided nothing at all. It

would have seemed that the first thing to be ascertained was the exact amount to be divided, yet the award did not speak of it, and in fact there were at present three different statements of that amount. The Dominion Auditor stated it at \$10,800,000; The Treasurer of Ontario at \$18,539,000; and the Treasurer of Quebec at \$10,000,000. The Arbitrators in their award had made no mention of the respective amounts to be paid, but had merely stated that each Province should pay a certain proportion. It had been stated that the Arbitrators had no right to determine the amounts, but such was not his opinion. The duty prescribed for the Arbitrators was to "divide" and "adjust" the amount to be paid, and surely, if it had not been intended that the Arbitrators should define the amounts, why had the word "adjust" been used. The intention plainly was that the Arbitrators should first determine the amount to be divided, and then divide it between the two Provinces. They had in their award come to a very minute calculation, deciding that Ontario should pay the proportion which \$9,808,728.02 bears to \$18,587,524.57, and Quebec the proportion of \$8,778,796.55 to \$18,587,524.57; but they had not stated the amount to be divided, so that at present no accountant could state definitely what each Province had to pay. It was also impossible to ascertain on what principle the two Arbitrators had acted, as they had given no reasons. To shew the operation of the award he had made a calculation of what the Provinces would have to pay, taking the total amount to be as stated by the Treasurer of Ontario, \$10,539,000. That calculation shewed that under these circumstances Ontario would have to pay \$5,561,785, and Quebec \$4,877,678, or only \$583,000 less than Ontario. Taking the division according to population, and estimating that of Ontario at the time of the union at 2,000,000, and that of Quebec at 1,400,000, Ontario would have to pay \$6,199,737, and Quebec \$4,339,816, or \$1,859,921 less than Quebec. Even taking the population on the Census of 1861, when Ontario had 1,395,000, and Quebec 1,110,000, Ontario would have to pay \$5,863,733, and Quebec \$4,675,815, or \$607,000 less than Ontario. He thought, taking these figures into consideration, it was inconceivable how the Arbitrators had arrived at their conclusion. Referring to the division of the Assets, he continued, these are not very numerous, consisting of 19 items. The amount awarded to Ontario is \$7,017,604, while to Quebec it is only \$4,191,022, but those of Ontario are estimated at between two and three million, and those of Quebec at

\$2,087,000, or those of Ontario 23 1-6 per cent, and Quebec 48 per cent. Taking one of these items as an example, there is the Municipal Loan Fund, \$6,618,050 in Ontario, valued at \$1,920,000, or 28 1-6 per cent, while in Quebec it is \$2,939,000, valued at \$1,410,000, or 49 per cent, although the Ontario municipalities were better able to pay than those of Quebec. By a statement among the papers it appeared that the cost of the Assets was \$17,734,000, but by a note at the foot it was stated at \$1,587,000, indicating that the cost of the Assets had been the basis upon which the Arbitrators had acted. Further, there was an item on the part of Quebec of \$3,715,000 for the seigniorial tenure, which, however, he considered no asset at all, but a corresponding amount of indemnity had been given to Ontario. Taking the statements as they were, it was impossible to ascertain by what mode of reasoning the division had been arrived at. In looking over the award he found no correct principle on which it had been based, and on looking over the whole of the correspondence he could not find the principle which he considered ought to have governed the Arbitrators, stated either by Ontario or Quebec. He had so far been speaking of the merits of the award, and it must strike everyone that an award so decidedly in favour of Ontario, which every one knew had more money than it knew how to dispose of, and which had been derived solely from the collection of the debts due at the time of the Union, the amount due on Crown Lands in that Province, amounting to five or six millions, all of which was capable of collection, while in Quebec it did not exceed \$1,400,000, a small portion only of which could be collected, could not be just. The Treasurer of Ontario had expressed himself perfectly willing to a division according to population, and when the three Arbitrators discussed the question, Mr. Justice Day maintained that the basis should be that of a partnership, while Mr. McPherson maintained that it should be that of population, and yet the two arbitrators had made an award that it should be according to the origin of certain claims or assets, notwithstanding that the Treasurer and the Arbitrator of Ontario had both previously expressed their willingness to accept population as the basis. He thought this clearly proved that the Dominion Arbitrator had not been just to Lower Canada. He, however, considered that neither the basis of population nor that of partnership was the one on which the award should have been given, as however just the principle of partnership might appear it would be very complicated. His opinion was that the true prin-

Hon. Mr. Dorion.

ciple was the ability of each Province to bear taxation, and if instead of the provision made for the division of the debt, it had been resolved to pay that debt, it would doubtless have been done on this principle—the ability of each Province to bear taxation. The British North America Act of 1867 made no provision for anything in the way of a partnership account to ascertain which of the two Provinces had most benefitted by the Union. It merely stated that the excess of debt beyond \$62,500,000 should be divided reasonably and equitably, and if the arbitrators, instead of going into the origin of the items of indebtedness of Upper and Lower Canada and then making an arbitrary division, had merely applied themselves to ascertaining the ability of the two Provinces to bear taxation, they would very soon have arrived at a just conclusion. He had merely spoken of the injustice of the award towards Quebec, and did not impute any motives to either of the two arbitrators, as he did not doubt that they had attempted to do justice, but he considered they had been mistaken in their basis. In addition to the injustice of the award, however, he did not consider it in any way valid, as it could not be, when three Arbitrators had been appointed, that two of them could continue their proceedings, and come to a conclusion in the absence of the third. Up to July, nothing had been decided except the basis upon which they were to proceed. At that time, Mr. Justice Day resigned, his resignation was accepted, and the Arbitrators and the Dominion Government were notified, and after that it was certainly not competent for the remaining Arbitrators to make an award. If the principle he had suggested had been adopted, there would have been very little difficulty in acting upon it. They would simply have to take the amount of surplus debt, and let each Province contribute in the exact proportion in which it contributed to the taxation of the Country. It would however have to be taken into consideration that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had been brought in since, so that if the ten millions and a half were added to the debt of Canada, those Provinces would be paying some small portion of it. But they could easily be compensated, and he had no doubt that both those Provinces would be very glad to get some amount, as it would enable them to carry out some of their contemplated improvements.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—How much would you give us?

Hon. Mr. DORION would be willing to give them a very fair proportion. His

proposition was that the House should go into Committee on his resolutions, so that the matter might be fully discussed, and some equitable mode of division arrived at, in order that the heavy expenses which would be incurred in case the legal proceedings already commenced were persevered in, might be avoided.

A POINT OF ORDER.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the resolutions and proposed address were, at this stage, out of order, and could only be considered on a resolution from the Governor General (hear, hear). The hon. member would find, on reference to the 54th clause of the B. N. A. Act, that these resolutions should be recommended to the House by an address from the Governor General.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the resolutions asked for no appropriation of money. They merely asked Her Majesty for permission to settle a question in a certain manner, and therefore, did not contravene the terms of the 54th clause of the B. N. A. Act.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member was only playing on words. The resolutions asked that the Imperial Government should by a certain act provide a compensation to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. If the resolutions did not mean that they meant nothing at all.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. HARRISON resumed the debate on the point of order, contending that section 54 of the Union Act was but an extension of a rule of the British House of Commons, which provided that the Government should have control of the public expenditure. This rule was in practice always extended to motions involving an expenditure of public money, even though no grant was actually proposed. The third of the four resolutions was more than a mere prayer for an address to the throne, and if acted on would appropriate the public money as effectually as if actually done by this Parliament. It seemed to him, therefore, that this was a proposition on the part of a private member to increase the debt by \$10,500,000, and in so doing increase the taxes of the country, thus directly contravening the terms of the 64th clause of the Union Act.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said this was no motion involving an expenditure of money, but simply an appeal to the Throne for permission to amend an existing Act. He remembered a case similar to this in Quebec, when Mr. Wallbridge was Speaker, in which it was ruled that the resolution was

not contrary to the rule of the House referred to. He regretted exceedingly that his hon. friend (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) should interpose this technical objection to obtaining the judgment of the House on this important question. The hon. gentleman, it seemed to him, should desire, more than anyone else in the House, to have this matter set at rest.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was sorry to hear the hon. member for Chateaugay, who was at all times a sort of constitutional executor, endeavouring to belittle these very forms which were regarded as the safeguards of their constitutional privileges. The premises of his hon. friend's arguments were that this subject was not wholly clear of difficulties. Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to give as a precedent a case in which Mr. Wallbridge had ruled a resolution similar to this in order. But these hon. members had forgotten to enter into details. The cases were not similar and the present rule was more stringent than that of the old Province of Canada. This was a question not to be viewed in a provincial light, but on its merits.

Hon. Mr. DORION proposed to amend the Act by substituting the following words for the fourth clause: "That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her to be pleased to recommend that the B. N. A. Act be amended so as to authorise the Parliament of the Dominion to deal with the surplus debt of the Province of Canada? Now he did not wish to interfere with the hon. members point of order and this would remove all objections.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said Parliament would not be prorogued to-morrow, and the hon. member could give notice of this amendment in due form.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the hon. member must take upon himself the blame of having opposed this motion, of having endeavoured to throw every obstacle in the way of doing simply justice to Lower Canada. He warned the hon. member that this was the view that would be taken of the hon. members action in Quebec.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that he was willing to take the responsibility of his course, and he cared little for the threats of the hon. member. He had met the hon. gentleman many a time before the people of Lower Canada, and he (Sir George) had always come out best, (laughter.) He had no desire to throw obstacles in the way of the hon. member's motion—on the contrary, he desired to see this matter settled by proper means.

Hon. Mr. Holton.

The SPEAKER decided as follows:—
"The motion proposes that an address be presented to Her Majesty, praying her to recommend that the British North America Act, of 1867, be amended so that the public debt of the Dominion be increased, and that compensation be made to the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia."

"In my opinion this motion cannot be entertained, it being in contravention of the 54th section of the Imperial Act for the union of British North America. In that section it is provided that *this House* shall not adopt *any Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill* for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, &c. &c., to any purpose that has not been first recommended by Message of the Governor General."

"The contention is, that the proposed appropriation being beyond the power of the Parliament of Canada, this provision of the statute cannot therefore apply."

"In its literal construction it does apply to the motion, and certainly it seems to me to the full as necessary in a constitutional sense to interpose the check of a Message from His Excellency under the responsibility of His Ministerial advisers before adopting an Address which may be followed by legislation imposing a burden on the people by a Parliament and Ministers, owing it no responsibility, as in the case of a Bill or motion for the appropriation of money within our direct control."

"For these reasons, the motion, in my opinion is not in order."

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

Mr. HARRISON moved for a return of names of all convicts now in Kingston, St. John, and Halifax penitentiaries, &c. In making this motion he explained that he wished to see if the Administration of Criminal Justice was the same in all the Provinces. Now that uniformity had been secured in criminal procedure, it was advisable that there should be uniformity, also in the Administration of Criminal Justice.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that out of consideration to the criminals it would not be advisable to publish their names to the world, and he would request of the hon. member, at least, to postpone his motion to some future time.

The motion was allowed to stand.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BODWELL moved that the House

go into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:

1. That it appears from the Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June, 1870, that the Railways under Government management in Nova Scotia have not paid the working expenses.

2. That it is inexpedient that the management of the Railways of the country, especially such as are not important as great national works for defensive purposes, should be in the hands of the Government, as such roads can be much more economically worked as commercial undertakings in the hands of private parties or companies.

3. That it is desirable to dispose by tender or otherwise, as the Government in Council may direct, of all the Railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick not forming parts of the Intercolonial Railway now under the management of the Dominion Government, to such persons or companies as will undertake to work them under the laws which now exist, or may hereafter be passed, governing Railways. In making this motion he said he believed that in France railways were aided by the Government in various ways. The same was the case in other countries. When Confederation was established certain roads in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia came into the possession and under the control of the Dominion Government. Under the Civil Governments they yielded a profit, which did not now appear in the returns. Statistics showed a net annual increase of the revenue from the Nova Scotia roads ranging from \$21,000 in 1863 to \$34,000 in 1866. The first year after Confederation the net revenue fell to \$18,944. There had been loss ever since. On the Nova Scotia roads in 1870 there was a loss of \$140,000. They were set down as assets to the value of \$6,520,990. There should be no loss in assets. The New Brunswick railways and those in other Provinces yielded a profit, and in the hands of private corporations such works were generally profitable. He thought the results in the present, as well as in other cases, proved the desirability of leaving all such enterprises under private direction—they should be taken out of the hands of the Government, which was under too much temptation.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Too much pressure (laughter).

Mr. BODWELL, continuing, reiterated arguments in favour of removing Governments from that temptation or pressure connected with the management of large public works. He understood that the tariff of rates was

considerably reduced since the roads came under the control of the Dominion. These facts showed that there was a necessity for reform. The fact that these railways cost \$105,000 for maintaining them during the past year, was sufficient evidence that they were mismanaged. He believed that the roads would be made to pay if under the control of private companies.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the hon. member was slightly in error as to the figures he had given, and had omitted to mention some very important facts connected with the matter. Since the Dominion Government had assumed the management of the lines, large expenditures had been caused by making extensive repairs on them. The culverts and bridges, which were of wood, had all to be renewed during the last three years. In the years 1869 and 1870, there had been a surplus of receipts over ordinary expenditures. During the present year there would be no necessity for expending such large sums of money on improving these lines. Then, with respect to the suggestion of the hon. member to give these Government lines into the hands of private companies, he would say that such a disposal of them would tend to injure the Intercolonial line, even though they could be sold or leased to advantage. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw his motion.

Mr. KILLAM thought it was inopportune at the present time to press the motion. He agreed, however, with the hon. mover of the resolution, that it would be much better to give the control of the railways into the hands of private companies. They were, under their present management, a burden to the Dominion.

Mr. H. MACDONALD said the people of Nova Scotia desired that their railways should be managed by private Companies. The roads, as they stood at present, were not a paying concern, and they never would be until they were extended.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL agreed with the Hon. Minister of Public Works, that it would be advisable to retain the control of these railways until the completion of the Intercolonial Railway. It would be well, though, after that road should be opened, to give these lines into the hands of private Companies. When he was in New Brunswick, he found that such was the opinion of the people there. It was believed that they could be better managed by private Corporations than by a Government removed at such a distance from the nearest point on the roads. He would say nothing of the injurious political effect the control of these lines by the Government must lead to, no matter who the hon. gentlemen might be who held office.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved an adjournment

Hon. Dr. TUPPER hoped the hon. member would not press his motion, for he (Hon. Dr. Tupper) wished to make a few observations on this important question of the Nova Scotia Railways. He joined issue with the hon. member for South Oxford as to the advisability of leaving railway schemes to private enterprise. If Government had not reconstructed these Nova Scotia lines, there would hardly be one of them in existence to-day. They had proved to be excellent commercial enterprises, too, for, besides aiding in opening up the country and developing its resources, the returns from them had been large, and had formed a considerable portion of the revenue of the provinces. He did not think it necessary to go into the figures, but he could show that his hon. friend was entirely unable to produce any figures from the public accounts or elsewhere that would give anything like a data for a correct comparison between the Government and private enterprises. The Minister of Public Works had explained very lucidly to the House the difference between the receipts and the expenditure. On the Windsor line alone, there was over three quarters of a mile of wooded bridges. That line had been open for 12 or 15 years, and the House would see that in the very nature of things, the time had arrived when a large expenditure was necessary to put the roads in proper order. The statement of the Minister of Public Works was satisfactory inasmuch as it showed that the revenue derived from these roads was largely and steadily increasing, evidencing the fact of the prosperity of the country. His hon. friend had stated that private Companies could always manage undertakings much more economically and better than Governments could, but he (Dr. Tupper) could not agree with that statement—and to show clearly the error of his hon. friend's statement, he had merely to point out the fact that the great public censor of the country, the man who considers it his special duty to find out every instance of mismanagement and pourtray it to the public, had been compelled to be silent in regard to the Government Works of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, while he filled the columns of his paper day after day with accounts of the mismanagement and corruption exhibited in the management of a great private Railway of the country. If, therefore, any weight was to be given to the opinions of that great man, the Government ought to take the railway out of the hands of the private enterprise that was so unequal to its management, and carry it on in the

Hon. Mr. Holton.

same way as they had carried out their works in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the hon. gentleman would say that he was really in favour of his proposition being carried out.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER did not say that he was prepared to go so far as that, but he desired to show the fallacy of the reasoning of the hon. member for Lanark. He looked upon the proposition that had been made as most monstrous, and he spoke not as a member of the Government, but as a representative of Nova Scotia. Was his hon. friend not satisfied with the enormous revenue derived from Nova Scotia, from its customs and its taxes, without taking away their public works to enrich the Dominion, of which Ontario formed so large a part. If it was found that the railways were burdensome to the Dominion, they should be joined together and used for the purpose of extending lines of railway east and west, and such a proposition would be much more welcome to the people of the Maritime Provinces, than the proposal that they should be put in the market and sold for the benefit of the larger Provinces. He desired to say a few words on a point which had escaped the notice of the Minister of Public Works, and to which attention had been called by the hon. member for North Lanark—he meant the statement that Mr. Carvill had been placed in charge of the railways in Nova Scotia, and subsequently returned to the duties in New Brunswick, and that a large increase had been made in that gentleman's salary over and above what he had received as Superintendent of the New Brunswick railways alone. The Government, in the exercise of their discretion, had sent the gentleman in question to do all he could to bring the two systems of railways into more harmonious working with each other. He (Mr. Carvill) went to Nova Scotia, and did all he could in the matter, but it was found that while the terminus of the Nova Scotia railway at Truro, and the portion then constructed to Sackville, in New Brunswick, was separated by some seventy miles of coach road, it was impossible to have a joint management of the railways of the two Provinces. Mr. Carvill, after having done a great deal to bring into harmony the management of the two railways, so as to be infinitely more convenient to the Department here was replaced by a gentleman who, for 10 or 15 years has been thoroughly conversant with the management of the railways in Nova Scotia, and who never was a politician. His hon. friend complained that Mr. Carvill's salary was largely increased, but he (Dr. Tupper)

thought it would have been only candid if he had informed the House, that a large additional responsibility had been thrown on Mr. Carvill, and that his duties had been increased some 50 per cent. As the matter was one in which the people of Nova Scotia pleaded some interest, he had thought it right to make some slight protest on the subject. As to the statement made to the House, that in consequence of political pressure upon the Dominion Government, the rates paid under the former management had been decreased, the simple answer was that the statement was contrary to the fact; on the contrary Nova Scotia complained that under Confederation the charges on the railways were higher than they were before.

Hon Mr BOLTON (Charlotte) said that the Minister of Public Works had stated that the Nova Scotia roads had proved a profit, but he certainly could not find that to be the case from the public accounts. He had already a motion on the papers for information as to the rates to be imposed on these railroads, and he had given notice of that motion simply from an examination of the public accounts. Those accounts showed a deficiency in the receipts as compared with the Revenue, and notwithstanding the glowing terms in which the President of the Council had spoken, he hardly saw much on which they could congratulate themselves. The road had now been in operation over 12 years, and as it did not yield any profit, either it was not a necessity, or else it was grossly mismanaged. The New Brunswick railways, however, were paying something over the expenditure and had always done so, and when their returns had been low. It had been in consequence of the Government allowing the roads to get out of order, and then having to expend larger sums in order to put them right, the President of the Council had spoken of the benefit derived by Nova Scotia from these railways, and no doubt they were a benefit, so long as they were supported by the Dominion. The only thing he feared was that while at the present moment they might get rid of the Nova Scotia Roads, when the Intercolonial was joined on to them, no one would be willing to touch them.

Mr. ANGLIN thought the member for Yarmouth was mistaken in saying that the New Brunswick Railway had always failed to pay enough to cover working expenses, for ever since its opening it had always paid something beyond its expenditure. He was not prepared to say whether or not a private company could work the Railways better than Government, but he knew

of no serious complaints as to the management hitherto, with the exception of that which had arisen when Mr. Carvill had attempted to raise the scale of charges to nearly the rate charged in New Brunswick, in consequence of which that gentleman had been driven from the Province.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER asked whether the hon. gentleman was aware that the Railway charges in Nova Scotia were higher than those in New Brunswick.

Mr. ANGLIN could not speak to that point, but he knew what a storm had been raised when Mr. Carvill attempted to raise the rates. They had heard a great deal of the value of these roads and the President of the Council had asked whether the House was prepared to sell them to the people of Nova Scotia, but he thought it would be very difficult to sell an undertaking with an expenditure larger than its receipts. Through the pressure of the representatives of Nova Scotia, the rates had been kept down to such a degree, and the expenses had been kept up to such a degree that the revenue was largely deficient, and he asked who would take railways under such circumstances. There was a strong contrast, however, in the management of railways under the Government of Nova Scotia, and under that of the Dominion. In the former case the system had been to spend nothing on the railways, and to get as much revenue as possible, while under the present management they had been greatly improved. He trusted the question would receive the consideration of the whole House as it was no party question. He did not see any reason to find fault with the action of the Government in the matter, and he was not prepared to say that he would agree to part with the roads to private parties, and he thought it very remarkable that with so large a revenue there should be a deficiency year after year. He thought when the connecting links in the system were supplied, the traffic would largely increase, and did not in any way share the apprehensions of the member for Charlotte as to the failure of the Intercolonial, although it might be some years before it became a success, but he was glad to see that the Commissioners were constructing it in a most substantial manner, so that it would require no further expenditure for many years.

Hon. JOSEPH HOWE said if the Nova Scotia railways were not built by private companies it was not the fault of the Province. Every inducement was offered to companies to build them, but none would undertake them, and he very much doubted whether any could be got to buy them now

and guarantee to run them. These roads had been built in 1854, and when the Dominion Government got control of them, it was nothing wonderful that they should be found pretty well worn down after thirteen years of constant use. The Dominion Government wisely undertook the work of improving them, and it was not strange that it should have been found necessary to expend a good deal of money on them. But that money was well employed, and would yield a good return.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD was of opinion that the sooner the Government could get rid of those roads the better. It was a waste of money to manage them at such a distance. The manager was under the control of the Government, and could settle none of the difficulties that might arise without much delay. He believed it was unfair to charge the difficulties of the road to the Dominion. The Province which was benefitted by the roads should pay for them, if they did not pay for themselves, until they were transferred to private companies.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY believed that the time was coming when it would be to the advantage of this Dominion to get rid of the management of these roads.

Hon. Mr. HOLT—Why not now?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said it would not do to part with them until the system was completed. Their value would then be very greatly increased and they could be disposed of to much greater advantage.

Hon. Mr. SMITH said he took a very different view of the management of railways from hon. members who had spoken to-night. It was all very well to leave productive works to private companies, but where lines did not yield fair returns, it was better to be able to draw on the public treasury for assistance. Did anyone suppose that the Grand Trunk would be worse served if it were managed by the Government? He trusted that the hon. mover of these resolutions would with draw his resolutions, for the people of New Brunswick, at least, would be opposed to giving the control of the Government railways to private companies. He would oppose any attempt to make such a transfer (hear, hear).

Dr. GRANT regretted to hear the hon. mover speak of the Intercolonial railway as an enterprise which was to be an incubus on the country. He was sure that it was an important work from which we were to derive many advantages. The country through which it passed was no barren wilderness, but would be one of the most fertile parts of Canada when opened up and settled. As a section of

the future Inter-oceanic Railway, it was a necessity to the Dominion, and he hoped the hon. member would not interfere with the progress of the work by opposing it.

Mr. YOUNG expressed himself in favour of the resolutions.

The debate was then adjourned.

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL rose to speak on a question of privilege. He thought as long as he acted in accordance with the rules of Parliament, he was entitled to the protection of the House. He had occasion to quote another gentleman's words from a newspaper report to sustain his position, and had mentioned that gentleman's name, but disavowed any intention of saying anything derogatory to his position. That gentleman happened to be in the gallery at the time and had taken offence at it, and had afterwards referred to him (Mr. McDougall) in the Senate in the most scurrilous manner. He (Mr. McDougall) would not take the trouble to notice this attack, further than to point to his public record for the last twenty years as a sufficient refutation of it. During his visit to New Brunswick he had the satisfaction of knowing that amongst all the classes to whom he had addressed himself on subjects of great political importance which they had invited him to discuss, they had listened to him with the kindest attention and courtesy, and if that was "political vagabondism" he should like to see it indulged in more frequently by our public men. Mr. McDougall then referred to the 13th rule of the House to show how contrary the course of the hon. Senator had been to Parliamentary usages. He also quoted from British authorities in support of his argument that no hon. member of another House should refer to remarks made in another Chamber during debate, because the hon. member making such observations could not be present to reply. He declared that if the body before whom these remarks were made of which he complained would not take cognizance of this transgression of Parliamentary rules and usages, he (Mr. McDougall) would take advantage of the first opportunity afforded him of vindicating the privileges of this House and maintaining the freedom of debate exercising his right to exclude that gentleman from the galleries. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. HOLT wished to know if the leader of the Government had nothing to say respecting this attack on the privileges of this House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member for North Lanark had stated

Hon. Joseph Howe.

his case and his intention to pursue a certain course without asking the House to take any action on the matter. He (Sir George) could therefore say nothing.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the leader of the Government should be the custodian of the privileges of the House. Since, however, the hon. member had refused to take any action in the matter he (Mr. Holton) felt it his duty to condemn this assault, for it was an assault made by a member of another branch of this Parliament on a member of this House, as a gross, wanton and utterly unprovoked assault—utterly unprovoked by any language made use of by the hon. member for North Lanark. (Cheers.)

The House adjourned at 11.15.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, 7th March, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Hon. Messrs. RYAN and FERRIER presented petitions.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON presented the second and third reports of the Joint Committee on Printing. Consideration of the reports on Thursday next.

ENQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT said that the enquiry of which he had given notice referred to a subject concerning which some misapprehension existed in that section of the Island of Cape Breton where he resided. At the time the Province of Nova Scotia entered into the Confederation, that island enjoyed the advantages of a steamer running between Halifax, Sydney, and St. John's, Newfoundland. But after the union the Cunard contract expired, and with it the subsidy that had been given for the performance of that service. The impression was strong in the Island of Cape Breton that the present Government was a party to the withdrawal of the steamer. His own impression was, however, that the contract with the Messrs. Inman was one over which the Dominion Government could exercise no control. When the Estimates were brought up in 1867, at the time the Confederation was being consummated, he had looked into them and found that the subsidy given by the Province of Nova Scotia for that service had been continued, but somehow or other, when the Estimates were before the other House the item in question disappeared. He need not tell the House that much dissatisfaction had arisen in the

Island of Cape Breton on account of the withdrawal of the steamer which had not only carried a great many passengers, but did a considerable business with St. John's which procured a large portion of its provisions and other supplies from Sydney. What the people complained of, and justly, was that when the Inman line was unwilling to call at Sydney, inducement had not been offered to other parties to perform so useful a service. Without further remarks he made the following enquiry:—When will the contract entered upon by the Government with the Messrs. Inman for the conveyance of mails from Halifax to St. John's Newfoundland, expire; and whether in case of renewal of the contract, it is proposed to require among its conditions that the steamer shall call at Sydney, Cape Breton, in accordance with the arrangement which existed previous to Confederation?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL was sorry that he was not able to give his hon. friend the information he asked, but the Government had no contract for that service, which was under the control of the Imperial Government.

THE NORTH WEST TERRITORIES.

The order of the day, that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the Bill in reference to the Government of the North West Territories, was then taken up, but before going into Committee.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU wished to make a few observations on the Bill before the House. He did not intend to oppose it at that stage, but there were several rather important points, respecting which he wished to obtain some information. He was of opinion that very extensive powers were given under the Act, and he apprehended that some difficulties might arise under its operations. He referred especially to that clause which gave the Governor General in Council the power to appoint a Council of not more than fifteen members, and not less than seven, if he should think proper; to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the administration of the affairs of the Territory, with such powers as might be from time to time conferred upon them by Order in Council. He could not help thinking that these were despotic powers, fraught with danger to the people that might be residing now or hereafter on those extensive territories so recently added to the Dominion of Canada. Would those powers always be exercised with discretion by those who were living at so great a distance from the Territories, and might not feel a great deal of sympathy with the inhabitants? He thought

that all our legislation respecting that important country could not be too guarded. Every possible security should be given for the preservation of the rights of the people. It should be remembered that the inhabitants of the Territory were different in many respects from the people of the other Provinces, and their feelings and peculiarities should be consulted in any political arrangements that might be made. Such a course would best ensure that harmony and kindly feeling so essential to the satisfactory working of our political institutions. He also wished to ascertain from the Postmaster General whether all the expenses incurred in Manitoba up to the time of its assuming self-government had been paid, and also what disposition was to be made of the Volunteers who had been sent there in the course of the past season. He hoped that the leader of the Government in that House would be able to give him some information respecting those points.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that he did not see any prospect of the difficulties to which the hon. member referred as likely to arise under the act. It was not intended to apply to the Province of Manitoba but to the North West territories outside of that Province. In Manitoba there was a constitutional Government granted under the Act passed at the last session of the Canadian Parliament. It was, however, necessary to legislate with reference to the territories outside of that Government. The provisions of the act were not new, but were the same which existed ever since the cession of the country by Great Britain to Canada. The Act when first passed made the same provisions for the whole country, but when Manitoba was formed into a separate Province then the act applied to the territory outside of it. It was now simply proposed to re-enact the provisions found in the original Act. The Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba was now, and would be, also Governor of the North West Territories. He would administer the Government of the Province under the constitutional Act of last session which gave to Manitoba a legislature and responsible Government. He would also administer on the other hand, the territory outside of the jurisdiction of Manitoba. He (Mr. C.) could not see what possible danger could arise from that fact, or from the Act giving power to the Governor General, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, to appoint a Council to aid the Lieutenant Governor in the administration of affairs. The hon. gentleman had apprehended that there might not be much sympathy felt for the population,

Hon. Mr. Bureau.

when the appointments came to be made. Now he was not prepared to admit any such thing. Whatever was done would be with reference to the wishes and feelings of the majority of the population. As respects the questions put by his hon. friend, he replied that the one in reference to the expenses incurred in Manitoba had better be made in the proper mode, and he would be happy to obtain the requisite information; with respect to the Volunteers he might say that it was proposed to recall them early in the season, perhaps in May, with the exception of 80 or 100 who would be left there some time longer. Every man who would desire to remain would be able to obtain 160 acres of land in addition to the free grant, or 320 acres altogether. Those who wished to return would be brought back at the public expense.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY called the attention of the Hon. Postmaster General to an apparent defect in the Act which seemed worthy of attention. If the powers of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, he argued, were to be extended over the whole of the North West Territories, there should be legislation to that effect. On the other hand, if there was to be a new officer, there should be provisions made under the Act. He contended—and referred to the Acts in corroboration of his argument—that there was no authority in the Act before the House, impliedly or expressly, to appoint anybody. The Act should be clear on the point.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Governor of Manitoba had two Commissions—one as Lieutenant Governor of the said province, another as Lieutenant Governor of the North West Territories. If his hon. friend would examine the original Act, he would see there was provision made for a Lieutenant Governor for Rupert's land and the North West Territory. That officer was appointed. He continued in office until the Act of last session was enacted, declaring that there should be a Lieutenant Governor for Manitoba. So there existed a double Commission. The concluding language of the Act kept in force the two offices. Therefore, the first clause of the Act before the House was clear enough.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—But the first Act now expired.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Not until the end of the present session—it was now proposed to re-enact it.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked how it was that in the present Act, there was not the same authority given as in the Act of 1869. At the end of the session, the Lieutenant

Governor of Manitoba became *defunctus officio* as respects the North West. He did not think the Act clear enough.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not apprehend any such difficulty as suggested by his hon. friend, but he had no objection to adopt the suggestion and make the authority more obvious.

The House went into Committee, and passed the Bill with a few verbal alterations.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:25 p.m.

PETITIONS.

Several petitions were presented.

COMMITTEE REPORTS.

Mr. BROSSEAU presented the report of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. MACFARLANE presented the fourth report of the Committee on Standing Orders, and moved that the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, be extended to the 22nd instant, and for receiving private Bills to the 29th instant.

The motion was carried.

POSTAGE STAMPS.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER presented a statement of sales of postage stamps for the past year.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN presented the report of the Minister of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1870.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice that on Friday next he would move, that the House should resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider a series of Resolutions respecting the admission of British Columbia into the Dominion of Canada.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice that he would move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act for securing the independence of Parliament.

MILITIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice that he would move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Militia Act.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS gave notice, that on Friday next he would move that the House should go into Committee of the Whole, for the consideration of resolutions with respect to the inspection of weights and measures, and also to the use of the metric system in the Dominion.

INSPECTION LAWS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS gave notice that on Friday next he would move that the House should go into Committee of the Whole, to consider Resolutions tending to the consolidation of the Inspection Laws.

CENSUS ACT.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved the third reading of the Bill to amend the Census Act. Carried. He then moved that the Bill should pass and be entitled "an Act to amend the Census Act." Carried.

CURRENCY.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS then moved concurrence in certain resolutions reported from Committee of the Whole, for the assimilation of the currency throughout the Dominion.

On the resolutions being read,

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings) moved, in amendment, that all after the word "expedient" be struck out, and that instead there should be inserted, "that the currency of Nova Scotia should remain unchanged and should not be assimilated with that of the rest of the Dominion." He stated that he had just received a telegram from the leader of the Government in Nova Scotia, advising the transmission by steamer *Carlotta* of a petition against the proposed change, numerous and respectably signed by all parties. He urged, first, that the Provincial Legislature had passed a series of resolutions opposing assimilation, and second, the forwarding of the petition, and asked that for these reasons, and in consideration of the state of feeling in Nova Scotia, the consideration of the resolutions might be postponed until the petition could be laid before the House.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that it was perfectly clear that the postponement of the consideration of the resolutions would imply an abandonment of the whole measure for the present session. The whole matter had been fully considered by the

Government. They were fully aware of the feeling in Nova Scotia, but they thought the case one in which the rest of the Dominion could not yield any longer. He had heard the opinions of many people in Nova Scotia on the subject, and one and all admitted the necessity of an assimilation, and the question, therefore, was in which direction that assimilation should be made. The currency could not be changed to that of Nova Scotia, as that would be adopting a currency at variance with that of the rest of the continent; and he was sure that before many months had elapsed Nova Scotia would perceive the great advantages derived from the change. The matter had already been delayed two sessions in deference to Nova Scotia, and the prospect of an International Currency, but that prospect no longer existing, he saw no reason for further adjournment.

Hon. Mr. DORION thought the question was not whether the Government would abandon their measure for another Session, but whether, in deference to the people of Nova Scotia, they would simply delay its consideration for a few days, until the petition spoken of could be received. That petition might contain arguments not previously advanced, but at all events he thought the Government might accede to the request of the member for King's and allow a short delay.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER thought that the object of the request for postponement was chiefly to change the day on which the Act should come into operation, from the 1st July to the 1st January. The Minister of Finance merely asked for concurrence in the resolutions on which he intended to base his Bill. If that concurrence was acceded to, as no doubt it would be, the Bill would have to be submitted to the House, and could hardly be read for the first time before Friday, but if it should possibly be read a second time on Friday, it would still have to go into a Committee, which could not be before the following Tuesday, and, therefore, the House would see, that before the Bill could possibly become law there would be plenty of time for receiving the petition and taking it into consideration.

Mr. CHIPMAN (Kings) had listened with surprise to the hesitancy of the Minister of Finance, to concede the very slight delay he had asked, as he would have thought that policy would dictate that every opportunity should be afforded the people of Nova Scotia to express their opinions, so that if the decision should chance to be in opposition to their views, they might have the satisfaction of knowing that all consideration had been

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

accorded to them—and he therefore again pressed on the Government that they should not force a discussion, but should allow the resolutions to lie over, and he thought such an Act would be very graceful on their part.

Mr. MAGILL (Hamilton) fully agreed that the people of Nova Scotia deserved every consideration, but that they had already received all the consideration they could ask. He thought that if there was any particular in which the Provinces ought to agree with each other, it was in that of the currency. The member for Kings had urged that the measure was objectionable to the people of Nova Scotia, and so it might be, but he thought the time had come when Nova Scotia ought to yield something to the wishes of the other parts of the Dominion. As to the time at which the change should commence there was no doubt that the 1st July was far the best time that could be selected. He was glad to see the measure propounded by the Government and was sure it would make the people of the Dominion feel more like one people.

Hon. Mr STEWART CAMPBELL (Guysborough) regretted very much that the story of Nova Scotia grievances had again been revived, as he thought that story ought now to be a matter of the past, and that the general good of the country should be considered, and he thought that the people of Nova Scotia fully understood that the time had arrived when they must yield in the general interest to an assimilation of the currency. There was no doubt that the petition would have but little effect on the minds of the members of the House, and it would only be using improperly the time of the House to ask for a postponement to allow of its being taken into consideration.

Mr. ALFRED JONES (Halifax) thought that questions of this kind should not be forced on the consideration of the House until the views of the people of Nova Scotia had been fully brought forward. He thought the petition, signed, as it no doubt was, by the chief commercial men of the Province, deserved all attention, and he trusted the Government would reconsider their decision and allow the matter to be postponed.

Hon. Mr. HOWE thought that, as the Minister of Militia had explained, in the natural order of things the petition would be received in full time to be taken into consideration, the matter should not be pressed further. He could scarcely think that the petition could contain any new arguments, as the matter had already received the fullest possible discussion and

consideration. The matter had already been postponed for two sessions, and though it pained him to have to differ with other representatives of his Province, he did not think that Nova Scotia could expect any further postponement.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he would be very sorry that there should be any feeling in the minds of the representatives of Nova Scotia that the Government was not disposed to give them ample justice and consideration. He showed how, in 1869 and 1870, the Government had postponed the consideration of the matter, and had withdrawn their measures in deference to the opinions and views of Nova Scotia, notwithstanding larger petitions from New Brunswick in favour of an assimilation, urging the great loss and inconvenience sustained by that Province. Postponement had, however, only been granted in view of the probability of an international currency, and when that ceased to be even a possibility, surely no further delay could be asked. The member for Kings had stated that he thought policy should dictate that Government should accede to his request, but he (Mr. Tilley) thought policy dictated the opposite course. He thought a further postponement would rather tend to increase than diminish the dissatisfaction in Nova Scotia, as they would imagine that the delay implied yielding, and then when finding such was not the case, they would be more than ever dissatisfied. He could say that the Minister of Finance would undertake not to pass the second reading until the petition had been received, and with that assurance he trusted the hon. gentlemen would not press the matter further.

Hon. Mr. HOLTUN said this was the proper stage of the measure on which to take exception to it. To deny the delay asked for was to say that no objection would be listened to. The Government could lose nothing in point of time, and certainly nothing in point of dignity in granting so reasonable a request.

Mr. HUGH MACDONALD did not think the Government were treating the petition with disrespect in refusing to grant the delay. The majority in this House was in favor of the proposed change, and no good purpose could be served by waiting for the petition. If, when it should arrive, reasons should be urged of sufficient weight to change the opinions the House entertained at present, it would not be too late to alter their policy. He hoped some consideration would be made in favor of the railway contractors of Nova Scotia, who would be seriously injured by a change in the currency. They

would be obliged to pay in the proportion of \$1 to every 97 cents under the present arrangement.

Mr. BURPEE thought the question had been fairly discussed. He congratulated the Government on having taken up this matter, for this House had been too often charged with having, in their Legislative enactments done those things which they ought not to have done and left undone, the things which they should have done.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER could not understand the object of the hon. member for Hochelaga, in paying this empty compliment to Nova Scotia. Since the time of Confederation the assimilation of the currency had been looked forward to by commercial men, for there was nothing which tended more to facilitate their business transactions than a uniform currency. In prospect of the adoption of an international currency, the Government had postponed this change, but, there seemed to be a very slight prospect of such a comprehensive assimilation taking place and it was time for the Government to assimilate our own currency. It would be ungenerous for him to object to carrying out a change which was accepted as one incidental and necessary to Confederation by the majority of the people of Canada. In assimilating the currency, it was necessary to adopt a system which would suit the majority of the people. The currency of Nova Scotia was a depreciated currency, and a large portion of the Legislature of that Province previous to Confederation, held the view that it would be better to reject it and adopt the currency of Canada and the United States. He would endeavour to relieve the hon. member for Kings of some of the apprehensions which he entertained as to the manner in which his constituents would receive this change. He (Dr. Tupper) held in his hand a letter from one of the most influential electors in that constituency, congratulating the Government on having undertaken the assimilation of the currency of the Dominion. The same gentleman stated in his letter that there was not a worse currency in circulation than that of Nova Scotia, which would not be accepted at its face value outside of the province. He (Dr. Tupper) regarded the matter in the same light, and he hoped that the hon. member for Kings would not press for a delay which, if granted, would excite hopes in Nova Scotia, which could not fail to end in disappointment.

Mr. SAVARY said this was a most important measure, being nothing less than one of the first steps towards making us one people. He was not disposed to hasten the passage of these resolutions or

to refuse the petitioners an opportunity to express their views against them. He believed petitions had already been presented against an assimilation of the currency, but he would also remind the hon. member for Kings that there was a large section of the people in Nova Scotia in favour of such a change. The constituency which he represented agreed to the temporary inconvenience resulting from the assimilation, for the ultimate benefit which it would confer on them in common with the rest of the Dominion. There might be some good reason for postponing the change till the first of January, but if the Government thought it best for the whole Dominion to have it go into operation sooner, he would not oppose the measures.

Mr. MILLS said that a good many hon. members had spoken on this question as one of profit and loss, but he did not see how any loss was to be occasioned by the change of full value. If a fifty cent piece were accepted as a unit here and were accepted as only half a unit under the United States system, there would be no real difference in the actual value of the coin, though it might be called a dollar in our country and half a dollar in the United States. It was purely a matter of convenience and nothing else, and till it could be shown that it was something more, there was no reason why the measure of the Finance Minister should not become law.

Mr. OLIVER said while dealing with this question, he would like to urge upon the hon. Finance Minister the necessity of increasing the number of small bills in circulation. Much inconvenience was felt from the want of them. There was another matter also, to which he would like to refer. In the section of the country from which he came, there was still a large amount of American silver in circulation, and he hoped Government would endeavour to withdraw it from the country and substitute for it a Canadian currency. There could be no reason for delaying the assimilation of the currency. It was one of the principal inducements held out to the people to induce them to accept Confederation. The claims put forward in behalf of the Intercolonial Railway contractors should not be allowed to stand in the way. The Intercolonial had already cost the country a great deal, and it would be time enough to consider the claims of contractors when they should be put forward by those gentlemen themselves. The country had suffered long enough from the want of uniformity in our currency, and he hoped this measure would be carried.

Mr. CHIPMAN said he occupied a position

Mr. Savary,

of independence in the House, and he held his seat to protect and further the interests of his constituents. He came here unpledged in regard to any action he might see fit to take on each measure that came up for consideration before the House. Therefore there could be no claims upon him to prevent him from giving an unbiased and untrammelled consideration to any Bill which might come up, and if there was any error whatever in his action, it could simply be one of judgment. He had taken pains to obtain the views of his constituents on this subject before the House, and though he was satisfied that the resolutions would be carried by a large majority he deemed it his duty to oppose them. It was no use for him to attempt to prove that the currency of Nova Scotia was the best for the people there, though he believed the fact was susceptible of proof. He believed that the House was not unanimously in favour of the measure of the Finance Minister, and he would therefore press his amendment to a vote.

The amendment of Mr. Chipman was declared lost on a division.

The various resolutions were read and carried, whereupon,

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved for leave to introduce a bill entitled: An Act to establish one uniform currency for Canada.—Carried. The motion that it be read a second time on Tuesday next having been offered, Sir Francis stated that in order to meet the views of his Nova Scotia opponents as fully as possible, he would not then press for that stage should the petition not have arrived. (Hear, hear.)

THE ELECTION BILL.

Hon Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of the Bill to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. YOUNG said it must be satisfactory to the House to know that the Government had withdrawn the very objectionable bill introduced during the two previous sessions. He considered it very objectionable, and if it had been carried out they would have seen in the various Provinces thousands of people disfranchised; and, with the very complicated machinery which that bill created, an army of officials would have been brought into existence, involving a very great expenditure. Looking at it in those points of view, the bill was one of the most dangerous character. He was therefore glad to know that it had been given up. It would have been very unpalatable throughout the various Provinces, particularly in the smaller, as it

must have interfered to a great extent with the privileges they hitherto enjoyed. The old bill was received, as they all knew, with a great deal of dissatisfaction by members of the House and multitudes throughout the country. He believed the House was indebted to a considerable extent to members on the Ministerial side for the withdrawal of the measure. If he was correctly informed, they had told Ministers plainly last session that if the Bill was pressed they would feel it their duty to vote against it. The proposition the Government now brought forward was one which adopted in the main the views so ably put forth by the hon. member for Hochelaga and others on the same side of the House. He only regretted that, while accepting several good points, Government had introduced various features of a most objectionable character. He observed the second clause of the Bill re-enacted the old election laws existing in the different Provinces at the time of Confederation in 1867. Now he thought it was very doubtful whether it was possible for this House to re-enact some, at least, of those laws, unless they were expressly stated in the body of the Bill. It was a fact that several of them had been rescinded or abolished by the Local Legislatures, and yet they were here, as he understood the Bill, re-enacted by the second clause. In addition, he saw no good reason why this House should go back to those laws of 1867 when they knew that since that time the Local Legislatures had adopted new laws, believed to be an improvement upon them. He could see no good reason for passing even a temporary law. They should take the laws existing in the various Provinces instead of returning to their predecessors of 1867. He particularly regretted to see in the Bill a special clause inserted to prevent the elections in Ontario taking place simultaneously. The Minister of Militia had seen fit to forbid what nine-tenths of the people of Ontario believed would be an improvement—that is the elections being held all on one and the same day. They knew that during the last general elections in Ontario there was a very large amount of excitement, bribery and corruption, and a good deal of violence. As regards other Provinces, they were aware that much violence was witnessed at Kamouraska, in Quebec, and in West Toronto and other Ontario constituencies much corruption was resorted to (hear, hear and laughter). It had been argued that holding the Ontario elections on one and the same day would, to a considerable extent, exempt them from the present evils. The Government, however had seen fit to prevent this reform.

Although this was but a temporary measure, he was in hopes it would be found possible to continue it on a similar measure with improvements. He saw no reason why they could not, in settling the election law for all time, adopt machinery created by the old legislature. They knew it had been the course pursued in the United States, ever since they became a nation, to receive members of Congress elected under the laws made, and in operation under the control of the legislatures of the different states. In this country he believed they would find no practical difficulty in managing the elections for members of this House, by simply using the machinery brought into being by laws of the Local Legislatures. For one he must strongly insist on some such provision being made one of the subsections. It would enable the people of Ontario to have the elections held simultaneously, as in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

A MEMBER—Not in New Brunswick.

Mr. YOUNG—They have in Nova Scotia, and he saw no reason why the right should be withdrawn from the people of Ontario. In New Brunswick they had privileges or rights not enjoyed here, including the ballot. They had in Nova Scotia the right to the ballot, but under this Bill he fancied that in the elections for the House of Commons they would be deprived of voting in this manner. The people ought not to be deprived of the ballot. He believed the time would come when the inhabitants of all the Provinces would enjoy the ballot. He thought experience had proved that where the system had been introduced on a great scale such as in Australia, it had proved a great advantage at the time of elections. They had the authority of the present First Lord of the Admiralty in England, for the statement that the effect of the Ballot in Australia had been largely to reduce the cost of elections, corruption, bribery and violence. In the mother country it would soon be law. Instead of depriving Nova Scotia of the ballot, it would have been well to extend it to all the other Provinces. Whatever action might be taken with regard to the Bill generally, he hoped some member would propose an amendment to that provision respecting the election laws of 1867 instead of those now in existence. He could see no good principle in refusing to adopt the good election laws on the Statute books of the various Provinces. They knew the Ontario Act, under which the elections were proceeding, differed very considerably from the law of 1867. He was anxious to know the reason for the departure in this instance. He hoped the Ontario mem-

bers would insist that the law should provide for the holding of the elections simultaneously. There could be no difference of opinion as to the feeling throughout Ontario on that subject. Unless the hon. gentlemen opposite were prepared to concede that point, and to allow the present law to stand, he should feel it his duty to move an amendment, and take the sense of the House on the point (cheers).

Mr. HARRISON said there were two objections to the hon. gentleman's proposition to have the elections simultaneously, and one was that he did not think it would afford a proper representation to property. A man who owned property in different constituencies, would not be properly represented unless he could divide himself into several, and go all over the country on one day (cheers and counter cheers). There was another objection: A man might become very eminent in serving his country, and yet become locally unpopular, displeasing to the people of his particular constituency. With the elections all on one day being objectionable to his constituents, his services would be lost to the country, whereas if the elections took place on different days, there would be a chance in other constituencies for him, and thus his talents might be saved to the country (cheers). It always appeared to him that these were two formidable objections. The experiment had been made in Ontario of having the elections all on one day. The experiment had yet to be proved, whether it would work well or not remained to be seen. It would be time enough to think of introducing it here, if the experiment proved a success. The hon. gentleman said that at the last elections for Toronto, there was bribery and corruption. That hon. member knew more about it than he did (ironical and counter cheers). There was none on his [Mr Harrison's] side, and he must have been speaking of what was done on the side of the Opposition [cheers and laughter]. He had heard no good reason yet for holding all the elections on one and the same day. Until his two reasons were answered, and the experiment in Ontario proved successful, he thought it would be premature in the House to adopt the principle. (Cheers)

Mr. MILLS said he was pleased with the progress the Government had shown in this matter last Session, and he hoped before the Bill became law, they would see further progress. He thought there were some features in the Bill which might be materially improved. He thought they were not likely to hear in the discussion of this Bill the kind of arguments used in the defence of the Government Bill last

Mr. Young.

year, nor likely to hear so much about the beauty and importance of uniformity. He remembered pointing out the effect of the old bill on the provinces not yet in Confederation, and distinctly putting the question to the Government, whether if a province was created in the North West, they proposed to apply the principle of uniformity with regard to its representatives; and among the defenders of the bill of last year, he did not think there was any one who laboured more zealously than the hon. member for West Toronto. He had laid down a principle with regard to that bill, which he thought would carry him much further than the provisions of the bill itself. He said that if all the elections took place on the same day the principle would be very objectionable, that it would be quite impossible for any gentleman to divide himself into a certain number of personages and make his appearance in various constituencies in the same day. There was just this to say in reply. If "A" had property in Essex and also in Elgin, he did not see anything to prevent the Government holding the elections in those two places, and if they did it would be quite impossible for the gentleman to be in two places at the same time. He supposed the hon. gentleman would insist on the Government amending this bill, and upon every property holder owning property in more than one place having the right to stay an election because it might hinder him from giving two votes. It was of the utmost consequence, he told us, that property should be represented, and the only way this could be done was to begin on a certain day at one end of the country, and let one election a day be held till all the members were elected. Unless this were done some elector might be cheated out of his rights. "A" might have a very large amount of property in one constituency and "B" a much smaller amount divided between two. Under this principle "B" would have a right, which he (Mr. Mills) thought he ought not to have, to vote in two places, while "A," the richer man, could vote only in one. The hon. member, for Toronto West, would oppose the one arrangement, and grant that person having the largest amount of property, the greatest interest in the election. If "A" owning \$1,000 worth of property, had a right to one vote, "B" possessing \$2,000 would have a right to two. This was the logical consequence flowing from the very sound proposition of that hon. gentleman (hear, hear). He was sure the hon. member would not be satisfied with the very imperfect representation of his scheme in the Bill now before them. It seemed to him that in this House, where the ques-

tions of property and civil rights were taken from their province and placed under the control of the local legislatures, the tendency of the representation must be altogether in a different direction. The time would come when those who contributed to the revenue of the country and took part in its defence, would have some say in the Government of the country. There was a time when those who had property were entitled to the vote in a different sense from the present, because they contributed most to the revenue. But now it was only just and fair that those upon whom the public responsibilities, debts and burdens were imposed, should have a say in the Government of the country. He did not propose to bring this matter under the consideration of the House at present. He thought the Government had now taken a step a long way towards the adoption of their views, making the local law of each Province that upon which the representation in the House should be based. He believed Government ought to go further, and have all the elections on one and the same day. It was a very important matter, no doubt, to an administration that felt they were not entitled to the confidence of the country, that they should have the power to influence all those looking for positions or favours from the Government. There was always a number of men in every constituency looking for public favours, and it was to the interest of the Administration to bring on the elections first in those places where they had the greatest chance of success, that those in respect to which they were doubtful might be influenced. Elections under this principle prevented Parliament from becoming a fair representation of public opinion. It interfered with the independence of the electors, for it was not more important that they should be protected from coercion by the Government. The object of this Bill was to give Ministers an unfair advantage over their opponents, which they ought not to possess, and when it reached Committee he would propose that it be so amended that all the elections in the Dominion should take place on the same day.

Hon. Mr. DORION said this was the third effort of the Government to bring in an Election Bill. They introduced one in 1869 and another in 1870, at that time they were informed the Government could not allow the local bodies to have anything to do with the elections, or with the regulation of the qualification. The elections, moreover, were to be uniform throughout the whole country; and nothing except the entire control of all these

matters by this House would satisfy the Government. The opposition having forced amendments last year, Government found they could not carry their Bill to their satisfaction and it was dropped. He complimented them on submitting an improved Bill this year, although this Bill adopted the qualifications prescribed in the several Provinces, and did away with the necessity for a double set of officials and all the machinery by which the list of electors was, last session, proposed to be made, there were yet apparently many deficiencies. He thought the subject of qualification of electors was very properly left to the Local Legislatures, yet as the elections must be conducted by officers of this Government alone, the mode of securing the elections might well have been uniform for the Dominion. The Government would have greatly improved the measure had they adopted the improved method of carrying the elections in force in Ontario and Nova Scotia. They did not want to have uniformity at all—not even in the mode of securing the elections. Instead of a uniformity law on the subject they were multiplying laws. They took a portion of the laws prevalent in the different Provinces, and even a part of those of 1867. They had entirely ignored the principle of uniformity. A portion of the proposed measure would lead to great errors which might have the effect of annulling the elections. If they did not enact uniformity, they might adopt the laws in force at the time of the elections in the several Provinces. He was a strong advocate of another amendment, namely, all the elections on one and the same day. This would avoid excitements or shorten them, to the advantage of the country. While elections took place in rotation, detrimental excitement and distraction were maintained. Moreover he did not like the clause giving the Returning Officer greater power than he had before—namely, by appointing a great many sub-officers, deputy returning officers, and poll clerks, to suit the new districts created, each of which was to consist of two hundred voters. It was also proposed to confer upon Government larger powers in some respects than hitherto. He thought one or two officers should have been held in the several districts responsible to the Government. They, feeling their responsibility towards the public appointing them, would have acted properly. The Government might thus carry their elections; but they might not long be in power. Another might succeed them, and it would be best that the returning officers should be selected from well known public officers. If not that, let Government

name permanent officers, as in the Province of Quebec, such as the sheriff. He would prefer the selection of the Warden or Secretary-Treasurer of each county, considering their greater powers. Besides, the subdivisions would be more fairly made by a well known officer than by any other. The lists would have to be subdivided according to the county subdivisions, and who would be better qualified for the work than the municipal officers therewith connected? The returning officer would have to make the subdivision of the electoral lists. The Municipal Council would be better qualified for that duty. He would propose it should make the subdivisions, and that if it did not do so till the issue of the writs, it should be the duty of the returning officer to make them. The Council, however, would do the work much better than the returning officer. Another abuse under the old law related to the assumption of the power of annulling voters' lists by returning officers. Thus large numbers of voters were disfranchised by persons assuming the duties of Parliamentary election committees. This stretch of authority had been in some instances the occasions of great trouble and difficulty in Kamouraska. Exasperated electors finding they were cheated out of their rights had prevented the elections taking place. He supposed that the same thing would have occurred in any other constituency under similar provocation. To avoid such abuses hereafter, he will move that no returning officer should have a right to question the validity of any list he might find registered at the registry office, and that he should use the list whether regular or not, and leave the matter to the trial of the proper tribunal, a Parliamentary Committee. Unless this were done they would witness a repetition of the scenes enacted in Lower Canada on several occasions. At least in ten instances masses of the electors had been disfranchised by these returning officers. In one case because an informal term was used by a certifying officer, "true copies" instead of "duplicate" in reference to lists of voters, the returning officer took upon himself to declare the lists illegal. A more monstrous abuse he had never heard of. This Bill was an improvement on the clumsy one of last year, and because the views of the Opposition had in a great measure been adopted. At the same time that he would accept the Bill he would move two or three amendments to remedy the abuses or defects, he had indicated, namely, to give power to the Government to select returning officers from certain county officers, and limit the power of these

officers to make sub-divisions of electoral districts only in cases where the local municipality should not have done so; and also to limit the power of the returning officer, so as to prevent him from doing what had been done with so much abuse hitherto, namely, declaring whether a poll should be held here, their or else where (cheers).

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. OLIVER resumed the debate. He said the old bill passed in 1869 and reproduced in 1870 did not give satisfaction. It was objectionable because of the expense which it involved. The opposition to that measure was so strong on both sides of the House that Government were obliged to withdraw it. He had no objections to the general provisions of the measure now before the House, but he did not approve of the absence from it of the clause providing that all the elections should be held on the same day. It was found under the old law that when the elections were held on different days in different constituencies, that it led to corruption. So generally was this known and condemned, that Ontario was opposed to any measure which permitted it, and he could not see why in Ontario, at least, the elections should all be held simultaneously. He regretted also that the system of voting by ballot had not been adopted throughout the Dominion as in Nova Scotia. It was the only true system of securing a fair representation of the people. He objected also that no provision had been made to prevent gentlemen who were strangers in the country for years, from coming in and getting some candidate to step aside and allow him to run as representative of a constituency of which he could have but little knowledge. In certain constituencies it was well known that bribery was practiced. In the city of Toronto, especially, it was well known that the candidate with the largest purse generally carried the elections. Simultaneous voting, he believed, would be the best preventative of corrupt practices, and if it could be extended to the whole Dominion, and the elections could all take place on one day, it would prove to be a most beneficial measure to the people.

Mr. SCATCHERD said that the law of 1842, which had been placed on the statute books by the present Finance Minister, remained almost unaltered to the present day, with the exception of the adoption of the registration system in 1853. So that during the last thirty years the law had remained almost unchanged. He approved of the amendment to hold all the elec-

Hon. Mr. Dorion.

tions on the one day, and would vote for a motion to that effect.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

SUPPLY.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the House into Committee of Supply, Mr. Street in the Chair.

A few items were formally passed, and the Committee rose and reported, and asked leave to sit again.

EXPENSES OF FENIAN RAID.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the House into Committee to consider certain resolutions affirming the expediency of indemnifying the Government for having authorized the issue of a special warrant for \$200,000, to provide for the defence of the Dominion in repelling the Fenian invasion in the month of May last. Hon. Col. GREY in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported concurrence to be taken on Friday.

SAVINGS BANKS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the House into Committee to consider certain resolutions on the subject of Savings Banks. Hon. Col. GREY in the chair.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that in proposing the resolutions he would endeavour as briefly as possible to place before the House, the position of the Government on the question. There had been an old Act of the Province of Canada with regard to Savings' Banks, regulating the mode in which these institutions should be conducted, which expired at the end of the last session, but was then renewed until the end of the present session. It then became absolutely necessary for the Government to consider the whole question as to the best mode of regulating these Banks, and of making proper provision as to the manner of receiving deposits. On examining into the matter it was found that in all the Dominion there was but one Savings Bank, conducted strictly as a Government Savings Bank, and which invested all its deposits in Government securities, and that Bank was in Nova Scotia. In the Province of New Brunswick there was a system under which a number of Collectors of Customs were agents for the Government in the management of Local Savings Banks, very much on the same principle as the Post Office system in Ontario and Quebec; that is, receiving the deposits and paying them over to the Receiver General, but in the city of St. John there was an institution managed by trustees,

and therefore not strictly a Government Savings Bank, but which invested all its monies in Government securities. With reference to Quebec and Ontario, a law was passed very soon after the Union of the two Provinces, which established a system under which certain Savings Banks had been and were now conducted. Those Banks numbered five; three in Quebec and two in Ontario. Another law was subsequently passed, prohibiting the organization of any new Banks, but not interfering with existing institutions. There were also in Ontario certain Building Societies, which were allowed to receive deposits on certain conditions prescribed by law, and with these it was not the intention of Government to interfere beyond making stricter provisions as to returns, and particulars of transactions. Then there was the system of Post Office Savings Banks, which had been in operation for a considerable time, and had been attended with great success, but this system had never been extended beyond Ontario and Quebec. The amount now held on deposit by the Post Office Savings Banks was \$3,353,205, and of that amount \$293,717, only, had been deposited in Quebec, and the remainder, \$3,059,488, in Ontario; and it would therefore be seen that the Post Office Savings Bank system had been almost entirely confined to Ontario, the Province of Quebec having peculiar institutions of its own. He desired most particularly to state that in endeavouring to put the Savings Banks on a different footing, he had no reason whatever to doubt that the institutions in Quebec had been managed most creditably, and the Government in considering the question and submitting the resolutions, were actuated by no want of confidence in those institutions, but by the belief that the principle on which they were based was wrong in theory, although hitherto it might have worked well in practice. There were also in Ontario two small Savings' Banks conducted on the same principle as those of Quebec, but which were comparatively unimportant. These Banks had absorbed the great bulk of the savings in Quebec, while in Ontario the bulk had been absorbed by the Post-office Savings' Banks, and the remainder by the building societies. The Government proposed as far as Nova Scotia was concerned to make no change whatever, but simply to develop the system already in operation by letting the Banks there have branches in the different towns of the Provinces. With regard to New Brunswick they proposed to put the Bank at St. John which had hitherto been managed by Trustees, on the same footing as that at Halifax, placing all the other Savings

Banks in the Province in the position of subsidiary offices, instructing them to deal with the head Bank at St. John in the same way as the Post Office Savings Banks of Quebec and Ontario communicate with the offices at Ottawa. Thus with regard to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the change would simply consist in the development of the system now in operation. He might mention that in all cases of Savings Banks which had been in operation for a number of years, there were certain sums that would never be called for and there had been correspondence between the Dominion and Local Governments as to the disposal of these sums, and it was now proposed that in the case of all accounts in which there had been no transactions, either of deposit or withdrawal, since the 1st July 1867, the amounts of those accounts should be considered as placed in suspense, the Province not being charged with interest, but if at any time hereafter any such amounts should be called for they should be placed against the Province.

Mr. YOUNG asked what percentage those uncalled for amounts formed of the total deposits.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS could not say as to that. With regard to such Banks as came under the Act to which he had referred as expiring at the end of the present session, he proposed that that Act should be continued up to the end of the next Session, and that in the meantime the Banks should have the choice of taking three different modes of putting themselves in a different position. Under the present circumstances, there were a certain number of gentlemen acting as Trustees, no doubt with the most benevolent feelings, and, of course, if it could be considered a sound system to expect that persons would always act in that manner, there would be no necessity for change, but these gentlemen had no interest whatever and no responsibility, and they received and dealt with large sums of money, the surplus profits of which were given to charitable institutions. However well that system might have worked hitherto, and he believed that in the generality of cases it had worked well, there had been exceptions to the rule both in Ontario and Quebec, and he could not think the system was so sound as to justify its being continued. Of the three alternatives proposed to be offered to the Banks, the first was to arrange their matters with the Government, handing over to them their assets, and allowing the Government to manage them as a Government Savings Bank. The next proposition was that they should incorporate themselves

with any chartered Banks in the Dominion, and become part of those chartered Banks, in that way affording depositors the security of the paid up capital of such Banks. The third alternative was that they should become incorporate themselves with a paid up capital, the minimum of which should be say \$200,000, but which they could extend as they might desire, and paying up 25 per cent. of that capital by instalments, 10 per cent. on organization, and the remainder subsequently, and being allowed to receive deposits on the same class of securities as they were now allowed to invest in, up to the amount of their capital, but beyond that investing in Government securities. With regard to the surplus which most of the Banks possessed, which had accrued out of past transactions, up to the time of their going into their new positions, it was proposed that that surplus should be invested in Government securities for the benefit of charitable institutions. The other parts of the resolutions referred to the returns to be made. If the Banks did not choose to accept any of the alternatives proposed, they would remain in their present position to the end of next session, and it would then be for Parliament to decide what should be done further—on which point, however, he did not wish to express any opinion prematurely. He trusted he had sufficiently explained the object of the resolutions.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT suggested that he had said nothing as to that portion of the resolutions referring to the circulation of Dominion notes.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that inasmuch as there would no doubt be principal Savings Banks at Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Toronto, &c., it had been thought that it would be very convenient to make the officers in charge of these Banks, agents for issuing Dominion notes. As in no other way could that be accomplished more economically or satisfactorily.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal) asked whether under these circumstances the present arrangement with the Bank of Montreal would continue.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS replied that that arrangement would then necessarily terminate, and in that way he calculated on a saving of \$157,000, the amount paid to the Bank of Montreal as compensation for abandoning their issue of notes.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought that the reference to the redemption offices in Montreal, Toronto, and elsewhere, disclosed the real object of the resolutions. The Minister of Finance proposed to make no

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

change in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and he might add in Ontario also, but he proposed to give the Quebec institutions the chance of three alternatives. So far he did not see any great objection to the proposals, except as to the principle of the Government endeavouring to get all the Savings Banks of the country into their hands, which he thought might be carried too far. He thought the House would require some further explanation of the matter, and he trusted the Minister of Finance would be prepared to state the conditions on which the Institutions could become incorporated, or could attach themselves to Banks already chartered. In his opinion the whole object of the resolutions was to establish a Bank of deposit for the Government. As the Minister of Finance intended to make the offices, offices for the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, they would have to have on hand the specie necessary for that redemption, and he also proposed that they should open Banks for Dominion stock, and that they should also be Banks of Deposit; and in fact they were banks of issue, the only difference being that in the mode of dealing with the sums received as deposits. He certainly had not anticipated the nature the resolutions, and although there would be a future opportunity of discussing the matter, he felt it his duty to point out that the proposal was, the establishment of Institutions having all the characteristics of a Bank of Issue except the name.

Hon. Mr. DORION said that as the Banks in Quebec had been well managed hitherto, as there were no complaints, as they had always paid the highest interest that could be obtained to their depositors, and at the same time had distributed larger sums among the Charitable Institutions, he did not see that the Government was in any way called upon to interfere. And as to the argument that the only security consisted in the character of the Trustees, he replied that hitherto that security had always been found sufficient. The two principal objects at present attained by these Banks, the payment of the highest possible rate of interest to depositors, and the distribution of a large sum among charitable institutions, would not be nearly so well secured by any of the alterations proposed by the Minister of Finance. If the Banks became incorporated with chartered Banks the interest would be reduced and the surplus applied to the benefit of the chartered banks, while if they became Government banks the Government would have the sole power of fixing the interest, and would appropriate the surplus. He was glad,

however, to see that it was not proposed that the surplus which some of the banks had accumulated should, on the banks becoming incorporated, go into the pockets of the corporators, as had been but case in a measure formerly submitted, the that it should go to the purpose for which it was originally intended—namely to charitable institutions. He thought the scheme proposed shewed a desire on the part of the Government to get control of all the spare funds in the Provinces. He had no objection to the rules as to returns being made more stringent, but he certainly thought that it would be much better to leave the institutions alone.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked the Minister of Finance whether he intended to meet the very strong point made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, with reference to the proposed establishment of Sub Treasuries, which his hon. friend had characterised as meaning in fact a bank of issue.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS was certainly not aware that the hon. member for Sherbrooke had made any "strong point," as he thought his hon. friend was the last in the House who could make a charge on the ground of the supposed establishment of a bank of issue, for his hon. friend had made much greater strides in that direction than he (Sir Francis) had ever made. His hon. friend had once attempted to establish such a bank while he (Sir Francis) had always considered that the country was not prepared for it.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—Are you going to do it now?

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—No. He entirely denied that the resolutions he had moved could in any way be construed to assimilate to a Government Bank of Issue. The amount of notes which the Government could issue was already prescribed by law, and it was neither the intention nor the desire of Government to seek an increase of that amount. His object was to devise ways and means of getting circulation about equal to that they had had through the Bank of Montreal, and he could say with the utmost sincerity that in bringing forward the resolutions under discussion, the Government had no desire whatever, to endeavour to establish what the hon. member had called a Bank of Issue, or to force the circulation of Dominion Notes, but they had thought that the Savings Banks would be a convenient means of distributing those small notes, which it was their duty to supply, and it would be found a convenient way of keeping those notes in circulation. The word "Sub-Treasury" had also been used. In the United States that word was

understood to mean a place of deposit for Government money, and he therefore desired to say that there was no intention to use the Savings Banks in any such way. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Hochelaga, he wished to say that he was not proposing to interfere with any of the Banks at present. The resolutions offered three modes of organization on sound principles, and if the Banks did not accept any of those modes they would remain in their present position to the end of the next session, and it would then remain for Parliament to deal with them. As to the management of the Banks, it was quite possible that for a given term of years the management might be entirely satisfactory, and still the system might be unsound, and their having been managed well in the past was no proof of continued good management, and he remembered distinctly a case in Toronto, and another in Montreal, in which institutions of a precisely similar nature to those now intended to be dealt with, had come to grief and had occasioned great loss. He considered that the resolutions would tend very much to increase the security of the public, and he could see no objection whatever to them.

Hon. Mr. DORION thought the depositors were the best judges of the security offered by different institutions, and that they ought to have a free choice in the matter. He instanced the deposits in the Montreal Savings Bank, as being more than the deposits in any other Savings Bank, as a proof that the public considered the principle on which that Bank was conducted, sound, and while he did not object to any number of Government Savings Banks he thought the present institutions should not be interfered with, and that the public should be allowed to choose whatever Bank they pleased.

If the present managers of the Banks became incorporated, and were held responsible to the extent of their shares, they would expect some remuneration for their risk; and in consequence the profits going to the depositors and charitable institutions would be greatly reduced. Therefore he would say—let the Institutions alone, and let the depositors judge between the two systems.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON pointed out that two out of the three Savings Banks in Lower Canada possessed special charters, and would therefore not be touched by the resolutions, as they were not affected by the Act to which those resolutions referred. It therefore seemed to him that the resolutions, if they were intended to affect these Banks, were incomplete.

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS repeated that he did not think the resolutions necessarily affected any Bank.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Then he would say that the resolutions did not reach those Banks as they were in no way dependent on the Act that would expire at the end of this session.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said there was no desire to interfere with the charters of existing banks. This simply gave them power to organize in a different way if they chose, but there was no coercion exercised, it was purely optional with them whether to adopt these regulations or not.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was quite clear that these resolutions did not embrace the special elections to which he referred, and they should therefore be amended. He quite agreed with the hon. Minister of Finance that these institutions were not founded on a secure basis. It was advisable that they should be placed in a sounder position before anything should occur to shake the public confidence in them. The system was quite indefensible and if serious disasters had not occurred under it during the last thirty years, it was only through the excellent management of those under whose control they had been.

Mr. POPE said that although the Hon. Minister proposed to allow these banks to comply with the Act or not, the Bill was so framed that unless they did so comply with its provisions they could not avail themselves of its provisions. It seemed to him (Mr. Pope) a scheme to squeeze the banks out of existence or bring them under the control of the Government.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the only chartered bank that could be at all interfered with by these resolutions was the Bank of Montreal.

The Committee rose and reported and asked leave to sit again on Friday next.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS presented a statement of receipts and payment to the 31st Dec., 1870.

The House adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 8, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Messrs. LOCKE and ALLAN presented petitions.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN, Chairman of the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, favourably reported from that Committee respecting petitions from the Toronto Corn Exchange; Pulaski Clark of the District of Parry Sound; Northern Railway of Toronto; Dominion Life Association; Ontario Bank; Niagara District Bank; Mutual Life Association; H. J. Hubertus and others; La Banque Nationale. Committee also state that rules have been observed with respect to petition of the Municipal Council of the village of Trenton in the Province of Ontario, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the Corporation of the said village to levy and collect harbour dues for the purpose of maintaining booms, piers, and otherwise improving the harbour. Committee, however, call attention to the powers asked for by the petition, which properly fall within the scope of the Local Legislature, Committee also recommend extension of time for receiving petitions.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved that the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be extended to the 24th instant.—Carried.

BILL.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN introduced a Bill to incorporate the Mutual Life Association of Canada.

The Bill was read a first time, and ordered for second reading on Friday.

PROTECTION OF THE FISHERIES.

The House, in pursuance with the order of the day, went into Committee on "An Act to further amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels," Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST in the chair.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL stated that the Bill had been found necessary after the experience of the past season. It was desirable that the officer seizing a vessel should have the right to take her to the port which he would consider the most advantageous for the public interests. It was also deemed advisable to distribute the proceeds of seizures among the officers and men, instead of allowing the chief officer to retain the whole of the one half to which he was entitled under the original Act. In framing the law in the first instance, the Minister of Justice thought it proper to adhere to existing precedents as closely as possible, and had consequently adopted the Nova Scotia law. Thus, it happened, that the law provided for the distribution of the proceeds in a manner which it was found, after some experience, desirable to alter.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN called attention to the fact that there was no provision made for sales by auction, and asked how it was that the power given under the original Act to the Customs' officer, was now handed over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that he proposed making an amendment providing for a sale by auction, but as respects the other point raised by the hon. gentleman it had been found preferable in the working of the Act that the power should be entrusted to one immediately under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The original Act, as he had previously stated, was copied from the Statute of Nova Scotia, where there was no such department at the time it was enacted.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN asked why it was that three-fourths of the proceeds should now be given to the officers and men.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that the Government did not wish to make money out of the transaction—only to pay their necessary expenses. The Government could not go beyond three-fourths, but they might reduce the proportion according to the exigencies of the case.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD enquired why it was that no provision was made for taking the vessel into port—it looked as if she was to be left out at sea.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said that it was quite obvious that she must be taken into port—it was superfluous to mention it.

The second section was amended, and now reads as follows: "All goods, vessels and boats, and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo condemned as forfeited under this Act, shall be sold by public auction, by direction of the officer having the custody thereof, under the provisions of the next preceding section of this Act, and under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor in Council, and the proceeds of every such sale shall be subject to the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who shall first pay therefrom all necessary costs and expenses of custody and sale, and the Governor in Council may from time to time apportion three-fourths, or less, of the net remainder, among the officers and crew of any Queen's ship, or Canadian Government vessel, from on board of which the seizure was made, as they may think right, reserving for the Government, and paying over to the Receiver General, at least one-fourth of such net remainder, to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada; but the Governor in Council may, nevertheless, direct that any

goods, vessel, or boat, and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo, seized and forfeited shall be destroyed, or be reserved for the public service."

The Committee rose, and the amendments were adopted. Third reading tomorrow.

NORTH WEST.

In accordance with the order of the day, the amendments made in Committee of the whole to the Bill providing for the Government of the North West Territories, were adopted. The Bill was read a third time and passed, and sent up to the Commons for its concurrence.

RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS presented a return asked for by Hon. Mr. Ryan respecting Copyrights; also a return from the Queen's Printer respecting the distribution of the Statutes.

THE INTERCOLONIAL R. R.

On motion of Hon. Mr. WARK, the name of Hon. Mr. Tessier was added to the Committee respecting the Intercolonial Railway.

QUESTION OF ORDER.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT wished before the House adjourned to refer to an occurrence of a few days ago. He had been sitting elsewhere alongside of his hon. friend from Cape Breton (Hon. Mr. Miller) and had been certainly under the impression from what had been said in that House, that his hon. friend had been referred to in a very contemptuous manner. But after reading the reports of what was said elsewhere, the other night, he had come to the conclusion that there was no intention to offend his hon. friend. Whilst he would be the last person to prevent anyone maintaining his just rights, yet he trusted that his hon. friend now saw that there was no intention to treat him with ignominy, and would under such circumstances regret having retorted.

Hon. Mr. MILLER called the attention of the hon. Speaker to the fact that there were strangers in the galleries.

The SPEAKER ordered that the galleries be cleared.

The Senate then sat some time with closed doors, and subsequently adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 8, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:20 p.m.

After routine, Mr. YOUNG introduced a Bill to incorporate the Dominion Rifle Association.

Mr. CRAWFORD called attention to the fact that there was a company in existence with almost the same title.

Mr. YOUNG thought it would be found that the title of the company he wished to incorporate was different from that of any now in existence.

Mr. BEATY introduced a Bill to incorporate the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.

Mr. POPE asked for leave to introduce an Act to authorize the Northern Railway Company of Canada to make arrangements to have and use the lines of other companies in connection with their own.

The Bill was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN presented a return of the distribution of the Statutes.

Mr. WORKMAN, in the absence of Mr. Ryan, asked whether it is the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates this year an appropriation for the erection of a suitable building for a Post Office in Montreal?

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that the Postmaster General was perfectly aware that it was very desirable to have a new Post Office erected in Montreal. He had been for some time negotiating for a site, but had not yet been able to obtain a suitable one on terms that he considered reasonable. He was still engaged in looking for it very carefully, and was very anxious to secure a suitable site.

Mr. WALLACE asked whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for a greater supply of rolling stock on the Eastern and North American Railway, so much needed to accommodate the rapidly increasing traffic on the road?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said, the Government asked for a vote on the estimates to provide rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway. The cause of the pressure on the Eastern & Northern Railway at present was, that a large portion of their rolling stock was required on the Intercolonial, and the moment this fresh stock was supplied the pressure would no longer be felt.

COMMUNICATION WITH MANITOBA.

Mr. BROWN asked whether any and what arrangements have been effected for

the conveying of Immigrants *via* the Canadian route from Fort William to Fort Garry, during the next season of navigation, and if so, why the same has not been announced.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Government had made arrangements for the conveyance of immigrants from Toronto to Fort Garry. The charge from Toronto to Fort William would be \$5 each, children under 12 years half price. Each immigrant would be allowed 150 pounds of personal baggage which would be conveyed free. Extra baggage would be charged at the rate of thirty-five cents per 100 pounds. Horses, cattle, farming implements, &c., would be conveyed at the rate of 35 per cent under tariff charges. From Fort William to Lake Shebandowan, there was 45 miles to travel by wagon. Then 310 miles, by rowboats and steam launches, to the North West angle of the Lake of the Woods. Lastly, 95 miles by road in carriages from the North West angle to Fort Garry. The charge for the entire distance from Fort William to Fort Garry would be \$25. Children under 12 years of age half price. This sum covers 150 pounds of baggage for each immigrant, extra baggage being charged \$1 50c per 100 lbs. The route would be in readiness by the 15th of June next.

Mr. BOWN—Are any posts prepared for shelter on the way, and are provisions provided for immigrants?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Government had provided places of shelter at the different portages on the way, and, of course, they would see that the Immigrants were not left without food.

Mr. PAQUET asked whether the Government is aware that accounts have been transmitted to the Militia Department—approved and signed by the Volunteer officers of the Berthier Company in connection with the annual drill of 1870, and that to this day the said accounts have not been paid; and whether it is their intention to repair this oversight which is of a nature to injure the cause which the Volunteers of that Company have, up to the present time, nobly served?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that claims for drill had been regularly paid. A small claim of Captain Gagnon had been struck out he presumed, because it did not come under the head of drill expenses. If forwarded to the proper office it would have been attended to.

Mr. WORKMAN asked whether the Honourable the Minister of Finance notifies all the Banks simultaneously when he asks them for tenders for Sterling Exchange, and whether any information is

given, directly or indirectly, to any Banking Institution in advance of another.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—The Banks are notified simultaneously when such tenders are asked for, and no information is given, directly or indirectly, to any banking institution in advance of another (applause).

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) asked whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sum for the erection of a lighthouse or a fog whistle at Salmon Point, in the County of Prince Edward?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the attention of the Government had been drawn to the subject and the matter was now under the consideration of the Government.

TARIFFS OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. BOLTON moved for an order of the House for copies of all correspondence between the Government or Department of Public Works and the manager, and previous managers of the Government Railways in Nova Scotia touching the management of and rates of, Tariff to be enforced on said road since 1st July, 1867, with statement of tariff charges now in force, and of any and all changes that have been made in said tariff since date aforesaid, with copies of all reports and detailed statement of accounts of income and expenditure rendered by said managers since said date. He made some remarks which were indistinctly heard in the gallery, but was understood to say that the Minister of Public Works must have discovered that there was a deficiency instead or a surplus in the receipts from the line during the last year.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he did not see how he could be gratified to find that instead of having a surplus there was a deficit. But if the hon. member would add to the working expenses of the railway the extraordinary repairs required, and make allowance for the excessive expenditure, he would find that there was an increase in the receipts of the lines. He (Mr. Langevin) contended that, taking an average of the working expenses of the different years, there was this year a surplus of \$3,000, and last year a surplus of \$14,000, and he really believed the surplus was increasing, and the hon. member would be gratified next year to see a surplus.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said it was undesirable an impression should go abroad that these lines were in such a satisfactory condition. He believed, when the returns now moved for were brought down, and the matter should be fairly considered, that if the repairs of the roads

were taken into account, the keeping up of the rolling stock, the expenditure which was necessarily connected with railways to be made from year to year, and which really formed the true running and working expenses—when all that was taken into account, he thought the hon. member would find that he was leading the House to believe that the state of affairs was more satisfactory than the facts warranted. It was desirable that those roads, in every point of view, should pay something more than working expenses, after making a fair allowance for repairs, but, at present, the traffic over those lines and the expenses of working them, especially by the Government, were such, that they could not hold out any hope to the people of this country that any profit would be derived from them.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that his remarks about the state of the roads, culverts, bridges, &c., applied to the rolling stock also. Large expenditures had been made in all these matters.

The motion was carried.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) moved that an order of the House do issue directing the Postmaster General to instruct each Postmaster in the Dominion, to take an accurate monthly account of all franked or free matter deposited or received at their respective offices, for twelve months, commencing 10th March next, and to make a special report to this House embracing the following particulars; viz., the number of franked or free letters, and amount of postage that would be chargeable thereon at the established rate of postage. 2. The weight of franked or free matter other than letters, and the amount of postage that would be chargeable at the established rate of postage; also that the Clerk of this House furnish a detailed statement of amount paid for telegraphs by any officer of this House, or by heads of Departments or employees, of the Government. He was understood to say that he intended to introduce a measure to do away with the franking system.

CONVICTS IN PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. HARRISON moved for returns of all convicts in Kingston, St. John, and Halifax Penitentiaries. The motion, he said, had been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of Militia, and the initials of convicts was all that he asked for.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he did not see the necessity of taking this precaution. The returns would hardly go forth to the public.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL entirely dissented from the view taken by the Minister of Militia. The sentences passed on criminals were not only as a punishment for them, but as a warning to others, and he thought it inconsistent with the principles of Criminal Justice that their sentences should be forgotten. He thought it most desirable that the names of all the prisoners should be published, as in many cases circumstances might have occurred which mitigated the guilt, and justified their release, but having no friends and no influence at court, they had no means of obtaining a reconsideration of their case. As to the names being withheld in consideration for the prisoners, he thought they had no right to any such consideration.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said he thought the hon. gentleman had replied to his own argument. He had said it might turn out that many persons were not so guilty as had been supposed. Then why publish their names?

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—So that their cases could receive consideration.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON thought the names should be withheld in consideration of the unfortunate families of the prisoners. The principal object of his hon. friend who had made the motion, was to ascertain whether there was any uniformity in the mode of administering criminal justice through the Dominion. He believed there was a very great difference in cases where the punishment was discretionary. He remembered a case in England of two Judges who had very different views of a certain description of larceny. On one occasion two men robbed a hen roost and one being caught was sentenced by the more lenient Judge to three months imprisonment. Thereupon the other gave himself up trusting to receive similar punishment, but chancing to be brought before the severe judge he was sentenced to seven years transportation.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON said in bringing the motion, his object had been as stated by the hon. member for Peel, to ascertain the amount of uniformity existing in the administration of criminal justice throughout the Dominion, and he considered his object would be fully attained by the publication of the initials. The convicts had been punished for crimes, but he did not think their relatives should have any unnecessary punishment.

Mr. YOUNG—with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Peel, he himself remembered an instance in which two lads having been convicted of the same crime, one had been sent to the Common Jail for twelve months and the other to

the Penitentiary for life, simply in consequence of being tried before different Judges, and no doubt many such cases had occurred,

Mr. R. A. HARRISON also remembered an instance in which two men having jointly committed an offence, one was sentenced by a lenient Judge to six months in the Common Jail, and the other by a severer Judge to six years in the Penitentiary.

The motion was then carried.

IMPORTS OF GRAIN, FLOUR, &c.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas) moved an address for a return of the quantity of grain, flour, and meal imported into the Dominion for the year 1870. Shewing the amount imported free, and the amount paying duty, and hoped the return would be brought down very shortly.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said there would be no objection, and the return would be furnished with the least possible delay.— Motion carried.

GRAND TRUNK RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved for an order of the House directing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to comply forthwith with the order of this House issued on the 17th February. He said certain returns had been moved for in the early part of the session, which, unless furnished immediately, would be too late to allow of any action during the present session. If the books of the Company were properly kept any expert accountant could prepare the returns asked for in two days.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said that he had been informed that the information had not yet been supplied, because the returns had not been completed.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the hon. gentleman could say when they would be completed. He thought the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway should not try to thwart the House in that way, as there was no doubt that the returns might have been completed a fortnight ago.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON was informed that it was utterly impossible that the returns could have been completed sooner, and they would be supplied in the course of a fortnight. There was no desire on the part of the Company to place any difficulty in the supplying of the returns.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said Mr. Brydges had written a letter, stating that the returns were not in the possession of the Company, but that the statement would take a considerable amount of preparation.

The returns ordered by the House included the gross earnings of the Railway during the years 1867, 1868, 1869 and 1870, the working expenses for each of those years, and the sum paid as interest on debt; and he maintained that there was nothing in the nature of these returns which would have prevented them being furnished a fortnight ago, and he thought that the statement, that another fortnight would elapse before the returns could be obtained, was equivalent to treating the orders of the House with utter disregard, and he trusted the House would know how to preserve its dignity, if its order was not immediately complied with.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was surprised to see the hon. gentleman in such a state of unnecessary fury and excitement.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised a point of order; that the hon. gentleman was not justified in saying he was in a state of fury and excitement.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that when patients got excited and confused about nothing, physicians sometimes found the best thing to be done was to make them laugh, and noticing by the smile on the hon. gentleman's face that he had accomplished that object he acknowledged the call to order. The Return asked for was of very great magnitude, and considering the immense size of the Grand Trunk, the fact that it was divided into sections, each with its centre, he thought it could not be said that there had been any unnecessary delay, for even with the advantage of having all information on the spot, Government often found themselves unable to supply returns asked for without considerable delay. He was sure that no delay had been caused by the Grand Trunk intentionally, although they might take exception to making any returns beyond those prescribed by law, but he was sure they desired to meet the wishes of the House in the matter.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said that the returns prescribed by law were made in the months of April and October, and the information asked for had already been published up to the 1st July, 1870, but it could not be furnished up to the end of that year until the returns had been audited, but he was authorized to say that the whole matter would be before the House within a fortnight.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he was somewhat surprised to hear the Minister of Militia affirm that there could be any doubt as to the right of the House to order the returns in question, especially as the Grand Trunk Railway appeared in the public ac-

counts a debtor to the extent of \$25,000,000.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said when he had explained his manner, he thought the hon. member for Chateaugay would see that he was correct. He had intended that the Grand Trunk Railway might object to furnish every information that might be asked by any member of that House, on the ground that it related to their private affairs. For instance, if he were to take a particular section of the road, say from Toronto to Stratford, and ask for a return shewing the undue profits of contractors and stating in what condition the road had been when handed over by the contractors, would not his request be fairly objected to? The Grand Trunk were not obliged by their Act of Incorporation to make the returns asked for, but knowing that they were subject to the Legislature they were desirous of complying with its wishes.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the rule as to information that could be obtained was very simple. All corporations created by Parliament were bound to make all returns demanded by a majority of that Parliament. The point had been set at rest years ago, when the late Mr. McKenzie had moved for a return of the names of Directors of Banks. That motion had been opposed by the Government, but the majority of the House had adopted it, and since then the right of the majority to ask for any information they chose had never been questioned.

The motion was then carried.

PRESQUE ISLE.

Mr. KEELER moved an address for copies of the correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Government of Ontario respecting lands on the peninsular of Presque Isle, Township of Brighton, with the report of the late survey and valuation of the said lands.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said there would be no objection to the production of the correspondence asked for.

Motion carried.

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAILS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved that an Order of the House should issue for returns of hours of arrival and departure of mails at Montreal, Kingston, Ottawa, Toronto, and Sarnia, with the regulation time for the arrival and departure of the said mails.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER suggested that some time should be named over which the information was desired to extend, and

Hon. Mr. Holton,

there would then be no objection to its production.

Mr. MILLS amended his motion so as to require the information since the 1st October, 1870.

Motion carried as amended.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) moved an address for a statement of tolls collected on the St. Peter's Canal since it was opened.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, stated that that gentleman, finding that no tolls had ever been collected on this canal, had addressed a letter to the hon. member for Richmond, enquiring as to a proper rate of tolls, and had been informed in reply, that there had been an understanding that no tolls would be collected for the first three years, and that correspondence was still going on to ascertain what the understanding amounted to, and on what it was based.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked, between what parties the understanding was alleged to exist.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said, that Mr. Le Viscomte had merely stated that such an understanding existed.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought, that the Minister of Public Works should be corresponding with some one in Nova Scotia, to ascertain whether some person had made an arrangement with some one else that no toll should be collected,—as no arrangement that could be supposed to exist could possibly be binding on the Government of the Dominion, it seemed to him that the principle involved should be at once repudiated when brought before the House.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said, that the question of levying tolls on this canal had not escaped his attention, and he had caused a tariff to be prepared, and had consulted the Hon. Mr. Le Viscomte as to whether that tariff would be suitable. That gentleman thereupon informed him, that when the canal was undertaken it was understood that tolls would not be collected for three years after its being opened. He (Mr. Langevin) had thereupon taken means to ascertain the nature of that understanding, and of the document on which it rested. The tolls could not be enforced till the spring, and therefore no time would be lost, but he had thought himself bound to make proper enquiry as to the alleged understanding, but he had no intention of leaving the canal free from tolls, unless there should be any binding arrangement in the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) had noticed that there had been no tolls collected, and had consequently placed his motion on the paper, as he thought it strange that an enlargement should be contemplated in a work from which no revenue was derived. He certainly had never before heard such an explanation as had been given in this matter, and when the question of the Bay Verte Canal should come up, he thought it would be necessary to make the strictest enquiry into the matter, before allowing any expenditure. He believed the St. Peter's Canal was in a very bad condition, and perhaps, as it yielded no revenue, the sooner it was closed the better.

Hon. Mr. HOWE was not aware of the very bad condition of the St. Peter's canal, but as the contractor had come from Glengarry such might be the case. When Nova Scotia was constructing her railways, Cape Breton came forward, asking only in return that this little canal should be cut, giving access to one of the most magnificent inland sheets of water in the Dominion, opening up an important fishing settlement, and opening up the coal mines of the interior. While in progress he had great doubts as to its utility, but he was now persuaded that it would prove of great value as a commercial communication. He might say that he had no cognizance whatever of any arrangement for freeing the canal from the payment of tolls, but as Mr. LeViscomte, who was more intimately acquainted with the matter than any one, had stated that such an arrangement did exist, the Minister of Public Works had only made proper enquiry into the matter.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N. S.) said the canal was of the utmost importance to the people of Cape Breton, and a very large amount of tonnage had passed through it, and as it was now necessary that it should be enlarged, he urged the Government to put something in the estimates for the purpose.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought they had not received much light on the matter of the alleged agreement. It was usually understood that two parties were necessary to an agreement, but in this case, although the Nova Scotia Government might prove to be one of the parties, no one could tell who the second was. He was not at all opposed to the St. Peter's Canal, and would vote for a sum of money to put it in repair. The work had been a long time under construction, having been begun years ago by Mr. LeViscomte and another gentleman, who, acting as Commissioners, had gone down to the place and hired people in the vicinity and com-

menced the work. Subsequently an engineer was sent down, but the local parties took the matter into their own hands, and pulled up the stakes, and the engineer left in disgust. The work was still in course of construction at the union, and had then been taken in hand by the Department of Public Works and been given to a contractor. The depth of the canal was 74 feet, cut down through a ridge of land, and consequently the sides were very liable to fall in. The original estimate for the construction was £36,000, but Nova Scotia had expended \$160,000, and the Dominion over \$90,000. He thought this a further illustration of what he had stated on a former occasion, that before any works were taken in hand the most accurate and reliable information and details ought to be obtained. He did not wish to deprecate this canal, but he thought it would be found that the 500 vessels which, it had been alleged, had passed through, consisted of some half dozen passing backwards and forwards.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he merely rose to take exception to some remarks which had fallen from the hon. member for Glengarry, who had referred to a very important work to New Brunswick, the Bay Verte Canal. Those remarks were peculiarly objectionable to the people of the Lower Provinces, because in the event of a change of Government ever taking place it was understood that the hon. member would be Minister of Public Works, and therefore the spirit manifested by that hon. member was anything but encouraging to the Maritime Provinces, as he had indicated an exceedingly sectional feeling. He (Mr. Tilley) only regretted that the hon. member's visit to those Provinces had not enlarged his views, and he would therefore certainly urge him to repeat that visit. Although much had been said about handing over the railways and canals of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to the Government, not a single member ever suggested that those of Quebec and Ontario should be handed over, and yet, looking at the whole canal receipts of the Dominion, the receipts were not much beyond the expenditure. It was with deep regret, therefore, that he had listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Glengarry, and he only trusted that his views would become more enlarged.

Mr. JONES [Leeds and Grenville], thought the hon. member for Glengarry should become Minister of Public Works, if he only continued to manifest the same economical spirit, he would be the most popular man the country had had for some time. The system of log-rolling formerly prevalent in Ontario and Quebec, seemed to have existed in the Lower Provinces.

Because one place received a railway, another had to get a canal. He thought this system of log-rolling should cease all over the Dominion. While fifty millions had been spent in the construction of railways and canals along the frontier of the country abutting upon the American border, nothing was devoted by the Government to opening up the interior of the country, to building railways or canals by the Ottawa valley. Interior works of this kind could secure a saving of many miles in carrying goods and passengers between the east and west. He would vote for no canals or other public works in whatever locality till the interior of the country received justice in the manner he had indicated—till the Ottawa region has been properly thrown open to trade and commerce (cheers).

The motion was carried.

Mr. WORKMAN moved for an address for a return of the total amount of sterling exchange purchased by the Dominion Government during the year 1870.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS stated the Government had no objection to the motion. Carried.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for an address for the report of the officer sent to make surveys of the Rivers Madawaska and St. John. He spoke in support of his motion, but was for a part of the time inaudible in the reporter's gallery. He did not agree with the Commissioner of Public works as to the diminished importance of improving those rivers in the interior of New Brunswick, in view of the construction of the Intercolonial and Woodstock and St. Andrews railways. He urged the need of the improvement of those streams, and pointed out their utility in the promotion of the development and trade of the country. North eastern New Brunswick had been rather neglected in this matter, he feared. The improvement of the Madawaska and St. John was absolutely necessary, and hardly any other boon would be a compensation for it.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said, Government had no objection to grant the address. He did not seem to have made himself understood the other day when he spoke on this subject. He had said, that certain indispensable improvements on works would be provided for, but as to the larger improvements they would have to be considered in connection with the route of the proposed railway along the St. John. If there was to be a railway, it would materially effect, perhaps, the prospects and position of river or canal ameliorations. All that was thought wise and needful would be undertaken at the present.

The motion was carried.

Mr. Jones.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Haldimand, moved for the Engineer's report and correspondence respecting the Hamilton and Fort Dover Plank and Stone Road Company. He gave some information to the House on the subject of his motion. The parties interested in this matter called upon the Government to do them justice in regard thereto. Their previous communications with the Government had unfortunately borne no fruit. He hoped for an end of delays, and some becoming action at last. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. LAWSON said, he could confirm what had been stated as to the great need of the road referred to, and the great inconvenience the people of the region suffered under the present circumstances. The Government should take immediate steps to supply the want felt, and to give a useful communication to a section devoid of railway facilities. If there were any additional papers since 1869, they might be added to those already asked for (hear, hear). He would move to this effect if necessary.

Mr. MAGILL said he was glad this motion had been proposed. The matter was undoubtedly important, and he hoped the Government would so regard it. The road to which the motion referred ran through an important section, furnishing the communication between Lakes Erie and Ontario. The road was so bad that he thought the people in that section had just cause for complaint. Now that they were so anxious to have Canadian railroads and canals improved, he thought a road so useful as this demanded efforts on the part of the Government, to remove defects that constituted a substantial grievance, and one that had existed too long. This was a question of practical utility, the merits of which the country could understand (hear, hear). He did believe the loyal people of that region deserved some consideration in this matter (cheers). They should not, by gazing at schemes a long way off, lose sight of projects of value near at hand (cheers).

Mr. RYMAL concurred in the remarks of the hon. member as to the necessity for the improvements mentioned, and the claims of the people therein interested. The road had long been in a wretched state so that it was indicted as a nuisance at the Wentworth Assizes, and the tolls were ordered to be taken off. In spring it would be utterly impassable by teams. It was one of the most important in Canada, connecting two important points of country. He hoped, therefore, the Government would exhibit some policy in reference to a great public road of this nature (hear, hear).

The motion was carried, in a form to embrace information accruing since the last return.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON inquired of the chairman of the Intercolonial Railway Commission, when the various returns ordered by the House would be brought down. That gentleman was aware the Committee of Public Accounts had had to stand still for want of them. Some of them were voluminous, but others were not so voluminous as to prevent their early submission.

Mr. WALSH replied that the whole of the returns ordered by the House would be brought down to-morrow. He had thought it more convenient in the interest of the Public Accounts Committee to bring them all down together.

THE INDIANS.

Hon. Mr. HOWE submitted returns in answer to an address of the House respecting the Indians of the Dominion and so forth. They were very voluminous, but he left it to the House to decide what should be done by them—how much should be printed and in what form. If there was anything which the people and the Government of the country could look back upon with considerable pride, it was their transactions with the Indians within their territory. It was quite a question whether this file of papers, which included records so honourable to the whole people of this Dominion, should not be prepared and presented in some acceptable form. He threw out this suggestion to the House as timely. When they contrasted the manner in which the Indians in British America had been treated, with that in which those on the other side of the line were, it was impossible to deny that the policy of the British Americans had been not only just and generous, but successful (cheers). He moved that the returns be submitted to the Committee on Printing.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. HOWE also laid on the table copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and that of Nova Scotia, touching the public buildings at Halifax.

Mr. LAWSON, who was indistinctly heard in the gallery, recommended the printing of portions of the Indian papers, embracing their names.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) ridiculed the notion of printing so much as was recommended. He thought it would be perfectly absurd to get these returns printed, when, he ventured to say, not one in a

thousand would ever read them, (laughter).

Mr. LAWSON said it was considered, as far as the Government were concerned, an important matter. Although the last speaker might have no taste for such matters, they had no reason to be ashamed of the treatment of the Indians, but there were some complaints on the part of certain tribes that the treaties had not been carried out. When he moved in this matter he did not think the papers would have covered so much ground; but it seemed to be the wish of the members and of the Government that he should proceed, and he had done so. The country, and the people he sought to benefit, would know how to appreciate the motives of the hon. gentleman who ironically suggested the printing of the names of the Indians.

INSURANCE RETURNS.

Hon. Mr. HOWE submitted returns showing the number of Insurance Companies which had made deposits according to the Act.

THE SUPPLIES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House receive the report of the Committee of Supply.—Carried. The items previously adopted having been concurred in, the Finance Minister moved that, on Friday next, the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.—Carried.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

EXTRADITION BILL.

Mr. MILLS—In submitting the present Bill for a second reading for the approval of the House, said, I feel that I am doing an act in the interests of civilization. I am sure that no one in Canada can be desirous that this country should be made a land sacred to every species of human villany committed abroad. By this Bill I only propose to confer upon the executive department of the Government a power that many able lawyers and jurists have held it possesses. At the present time a different doctrine prevails; and the ministry here would not advise the surrender of a criminal, however atrocious his act might be, unless required to do so in fulfilment of some treaty obligation. Sir, I have no fear that the power conferred by this Bill upon the administration will be abused. I have never reposed any great degree of confidence in the Minister of Militia or his colleagues, but I am not afraid that any ministry, responsible to Parliament for their conduct, will so far

abuse their power as to make this country an insecure asylum to those who have been elsewhere simply political offenders. It is well known to members of this House who have considered this subject that three distinct doctrines have been held by jurists and writers upon public law. 1. That to surrender a criminal who has taken refuge in a foreign country, is a matter of perfect obligation. 2. That it is a matter of imperfect obligation or comity resting with the Executive Department of the Government to exercise upon its own discretion. 3. That it is not even a matter of comity unless made such by positive law. If we look, sir, into the history of this question, we will find that each doctrine was the outcome of peculiar political circumstances and of the laws of social growth. Each in its own age, in some degree at least, shows that the instincts of humanity have always succeeded in devising means of keeping in check the instincts of violence. Under the Dominion of the Roman Empire the doctrine of perfect obligation was necessarily recognised, and it is not difficult to understand that the Government which would refuse to surrender a criminal to the republic was looked upon as a party to the offence. I don't wish to be understood as maintaining that there was then such a thing as public law. The law of nations then was used in contradistinction to the law of the Quirinal and as synonymous with the law of nature. It was a name given to those features of the municipal law which were everywhere the same, and which, from the power of the Republic and the Empire, gave to it some of the characteristics of modern Public Law.

The second doctrine is that extradition for crime as a matter of comity grew out of the state of society during the middle ages. It is of feudal origin, and had not reference so much to ordinary crimes as to political offences. Ordinary criminals seldom sought refuge abroad. It was unnecessary. The forests were in every country large, the places of concealment numerous, the topography of every country but imperfectly known, the criminal class large, so that the robber or the assassin seldom felt that it was necessary to go beyond his own frontier in order to find a safe retreat. When the struggle in Western Europe began between the Great Barons, or between rival houses of the nobility, it was common for the defeated party to seek safety abroad. He could not, or at least, would not seek safety in obscurity within his own country. There was something chivalrous in making a country a secure retreat for the nobleman who had been compelled to fly from the

concilium regium of his own country, to become an exile at a foreign court. Each country became, to political offenders from every other, what the church and the monastery had long been to offenders of an earlier period—a safe retreat to the helpless; and the surrender of a political refugee was generally viewed as an act dishonorable to the government which made it. There was as yet no such thing as Public Law. After the downfall of the Roman Empire, which from its extent imperfectly served to meet the wants which the absence of International Law created, the instincts of man suggested a substitute. There was in the political as in the religious world, a longing for the just and the true, and with Otho the Great, came the Holy Roman Empire which was to serve as an arbiter between the States of Europe. It was not until modern society had made a good deal of progress, and the period of violence had come to an end, that it became common to surrender criminals. There was, in fact, before no necessity for it. The crusades had done much to break down the barriers of national ignorance and isolation. The growth of commerce had done still more. The products of the interior had forced highways to the coast. The executive of every country turned its attention from intestine wars, to the array of criminals that had grown up in the heart of the state from neglect, and the criminal sought abroad the safety he could no longer find at home. But the idea which had grown up in connection with the surrender of political offenders, had taken too firm a hold upon the minds of public men to permit the ancient doctrine of perfect obligation ever again to regain the ascendancy. It will be seen from what I have said that the doctrine is much broader than the class of facts in which it originated would warrant. Writers like Grotius and Vattel had asserted the doctrine of perfect obligation; but in doing so they reasoned rather from principles they believed to be just, than from well established usage. It may be confidently asserted that from the days of Philip Augustus to the Revolution in France, and from the period of Edward IV. to the fall of the House of Stuart in England, the monarch gained power at the expense of the aristocracy, and during this period, as a matter of practice, the right of asylum, notwithstanding treaties of extradition, was strongly asserted. Then, whenever a representative body became the aggressive element in the government of the State, and won back to itself, by slow degrees, that power which the king in the former epoch gained from the decaying power of the barons, this spirit of limiting the prerogative power of the executive was

Hon. Mr. Mills.

not confined to the legislative departments of the Government, but extended itself to the courts. In England, especially since the accession of William III. the courts have on the whole shown a strong inclination to act in consonance with the spirit of the commons, and to admit no power of prerogation simply growing out of the nature of contrary, to deny the existence of every power, which cannot be traced to direct legislation, or to well established and long continued practice. The power of the Crown, therefore, to make surrender of criminals who may have sought an asylum upon British soil has been denied by the courts, not because of any obvious abuse that could well grow out of its admission; this denial is only a manifestation of the wakefulness of the spirit of liberty—jealous, yet uninstructed—always active—always vigilant—groping its way slowly along the confines of political knowledge, and sweeping away before it in the interest of freedom, powers which made the executive efficient as well as powers which made it dangerous. The moment, under our English system, that it began to be denied that the extradition of criminals was a matter of perfect obligation, it was obvious that the Crown could not maintain its claim to exercise this power as a matter of comity. Why it could occupy this middle ground is easily understood. It would indeed be absurd to say that a State was under obligation to extradite criminals, and at the same time to maintain that no department of the Government had the power to execute the obligation that public law imposes upon the nation. When extradition began to be treated by publicists as a matter of comity, it is not difficult to understand how it was that the existence of a discretionary power in the Crown began to be denied. In fact this prerogative right to extradite criminals is one that could only live while it had a perfect obligation to support it.

Mr. MILLS here reviewed at length all the English, Canadian, and American cases of extradition, and showed the change in the opinion of the Courts without any legislation upon the subject. He referred to the opinion expressed by the court in a celebrated case at Calcutta, to the opinions expressed by the Law Lords in the Creole case, and to a speech of Sir Samuel Romilly on the alien Bill as early as 1818. He said:—I don't think it ought to be a task of either great difficulty or great delicacy, to provide that when a criminal flies to this country, that he shall not find here immunity from the punishment his crime deserves: I trust, therefore, in undertaking to confer this power upon the Executive of Canada, I shall not find in this House any fear of a reform so

necessary, or any feeling of dislike or distrust in the United States that will prevent us doing an act, not so much of justice to them, as to ourselves; an act that will go far to prevent this country becoming a place of refuge for a very dangerous class of persons. We cannot have any wish to win the admiration of a class of desperate men by making them feel that so long as they keep outside of the treaty they will find this country a land of safety and peace to human villany. We have had of late striking illustrations of the tendency of events in this particular. We have had men seeking legal advice with the view of ascertaining whether certain acts would bring the doers within the terms of the Extradition Treaty or not. I say to permit any such persons, deliberately employing the instruments that have been called into existence for the security of life and property, the promotion of justice, and the defence of innocence against fraud and outrage, to feel that there is in any civilized country immunity for such offenders, is the disgrace of our age. It is notorious that the criminal law has not kept pace with the progress of society, and rules and principles that were sufficient in a former epoch, are altogether unequal to the exigencies of our times. In most of the States of Continental Europe the criminal law is held to be personal, and, being personal, accompanies the party wherever he may go.—The Prussian or Dane who commits murder in England, is guilty of murder by the law of his own country as well as by the law of England. If he escapes to his native country he is not extradited, because he has made himself liable to be there punished. The criminal jurisprudence of the common law is of very different principles. Wherever it prevails, crime is territorial, and a British subject who has committed a crime abroad, not embraced in any treaty stipulation, or any crime in a country with which England has no treaty, is not less secure from punishment than a stranger and alien, except when by legislation the Common Law principle has been departed from, and it is because this is the case that in England and the United States when a party is charged with crime under the Extradition Treaty, his nationality is held immaterial. I have no doubt whatever this may be, I think the criminal for all ordinary offences should be extradited to the place where his crime has been committed. The witnesses both for the prosecution and the defence are most likely to be there. To try a man far away from the locality in which the crime with which he is charged has been committed; with none of the witnesses by which his defence may be

made good, near; with no power to compel their attendance, might sometimes prove a practical denial of the necessary means of defence. It is in the locality in which the crime has been committed that justice calls most loudly for the punishment of the offender. It is there that the example of the punishment is most needed. It is there, too, that the right and burden of retribution properly belongs. Let me give an illustration of the importance of this measure. A gentleman from Prescott, with his family, might cross the St. Lawrence to Ogdensburg, his wife and his daughters might there be grossly outraged, and the criminal might cross the river to Prescott and he is secure. As our law now stands he is safe from punishment, even though he is a resident of Prescott. This, no doubt, we can remedy by the necessary legislation, and it ought to be done. But can we provide here for the punishment of an American for an offence committed upon American territory and within the jurisdiction of the American courts? We can, in effect, do this by his extradition; we can enable our Government to send him back to await there the punishment due to his crime. I do not propose to go further than to enable our Government to treat this matter of extradition as a matter of comity; but it ought never to be forgotten that although a matter of comity, it is a power that should be exercised as readily and as promptly in the interests of justice and good neighbourhood, as if it were a matter of obligation. I think, too, we ought not to stand up and say to a foreign state, "We will not permit you to punish for any other than the specific offence for which the party has been extradited," when that other offence is one for which he might have been extradited. He is extradited for forgery, but on the trial it clearly appears that the crime was larceny, and he is acquitted, and escapes punishment altogether; or, like Lamirande, is convicted notwithstanding the evidence to the contrary.—If we, in this matter, seek for a general principle upon which to base our policy, and by which, as a matter of jurisprudence, it can be explained and defended, we shall find no other than this, that once the party charged with crime is in the hands of the Government demanding him, their power over him, as a matter of right, should extend to every crime for which extradition may be had. A more narrow and less rational basis can serve no other purpose than to occasionally defeat the ends of justice. Mr. Mills then defined the provision of his Bill as piracy by the Law of nations. He explained the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in England in the case of the Gerity Pirates,

Mr. Mills.

and read the opinion of Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, to which he sought to give effect. He pointed out the mischiefs that might arise under the treaty as it had been interpreted. He said; we legislate to protect the lives and property of our people. We make sanitary laws to preserve their health, and I ask, can it be for a moment supposed that we may not prevent moral contagion? Shall we say to the man with cholera, you cannot come upon our shores, but are we unable to say to the man festering in moral corruption you are free here; we have no power to arrest you, although if you were one of our own people, we would feel it our duty to provide you a lodging in the penitentiary? The very existence of the power conferred by this Bill will, in a great measure, supersede the necessity for its exercise. I am glad to know, sir, that this is a matter in which we need not wait for reciprocity. It is not a good alone done to the people and Government of the United States; we do even a greater good to the people of this country, by removing from amongst them a desperate and dangerous class of persons. Gibbon, in the earlier part of his great work on the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,' gives as the principal reason for the success of the emperors in crushing out the spirit of disaffection, the vastness of the empire. There was no place, in all the world, to which the leader of a defeated party could safely retire. The whole world was a vast prison house.—The hopes and spirits of those who cherished the memory of the rule of the Conscript Fathers, or of the Tribunes of the people, withered at the thought of the omnipresence of imperial power. May we not hope that by making bad men feel—men whose conduct is such that there can be no generous thought to sustain or to approve—that from the Gulf of Mexico to the frozen north, and from the Pacific to the Atlantic, they may be pursued and brought to justice. I say may we not hope to materially diminish crime and thus render life and property more secure.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said the whole of the hon. gentleman's speech consisted of a *petitio principii*. He assumed all through that the Government of Canada had the power to make a treaty, which it certainly had not. Besides this grave defect in his case many of the clauses of the Bill were objectionable. The power to extradite British subjects was an Imperial power solely. It was not a colonial power derived from Imperial authority.

Mr. MILLS—This power was exercised in Upper Canada.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON replied it was exercised under peculiar circumstances,

but its exercise on that occasion [did not prove it was rightly exercised. The Crown itself could not deal with criminals apart from Parliament, and because it alone had power to deal with the right of the subject. So far as the colony dealt with extradition, it dealt with it under Imperial authority and under no other. Although the Crown should make a treaty of extradition, Parliament would be required to give it effect. We might do things affecting the method of procedure, but the moment we touched the business of extradition we invaded an Imperial right. The hon. gentleman stated he had no idea of compelling the Government to give a criminal up. If not, what was the benefit of the Bill—of assuming the power proposed? If we had the power, and only exercised it at particular periods, the results might not be satisfactory. If we had it, let it be exercised. If we had it not, why attempt to exercise it? (hear, hear). The very course of the hon. gentleman in not placing the two acts in the same position, showed he was in doubt of the very power he mooted. With regard to the results of extradition, there had not been a single trial of a criminal given up, except that by Judge Lynch of the unfortunate men recently handed over, and who were hanged. If we were even to have a treaty it must be on the principle of that between France and England, according to which each Government gave a pledge that the returned criminal should be tried for the offence charged, or if not, restored to the country, where he had first sought shelter. Let us not pass a law of the kind proposed till we are certain of our power in the matter, and receive some assurance that the extradited criminals would be tried. Till we are satisfied on those points, let us act under the Imperial authority as at present (cheers).

Mr. HARRISON said, that the hon. member who had introduced this measure deserved the thanks of the House for having brought such an important question before the House. He agreed with the hon. member that in the absence of an extradition treaty or statute, there was no obligation on the part of a Government to deliver over a criminal to another Government, but it was a question whether, without such a treaty, there was that power. The only treaty in existence between Great Britain and the United States at present, was the Ashburton Treaty, which was wholly insufficient to meet the requirements of the two countries. It extended to seven crimes, among which were not included larceny and embezzlement, the two crimes of most frequent occurrence. Without including

these two crimes the treaty was defective. The reason why they were not so included was, that slavery was in existence in the United States when the treaty was signed, and it was feared that, under color of the term larceny, masters would follow their slaves here and arrest them for the larceny of the very clothes that they wore, as being the property of their masters. There was this fear of aiding slavery, but now this reason was buried forever, and the Ashburton Treaty should be amended to include larceny and offences of that kind. In the case of the express robbery referred to, where an express train was robbed of \$200,000, and the robbers, after the commission of the crime, fled to Canada, the defence set up was that the express agent aided the robbers. It was alleged to be a preconcerted game to which the guard was a party, and it was therefore, no robbery, but simply a larceny. If that defence had been successful there would have been no extradition in the case, and the criminals were quite surprised that they were not allowed to remain in the country and increase our capital by \$200,000 (hear hear, and laughter), and he might say, our population in a very undesirable manner. After citing other cases to show the necessity of amending the Ashburton Treaty. Mr. Harrison continued, there were great difficulties in the application of the treaty even as it stood at present, and he hoped if this discussion would have no other result, it would induce the Government to take action to have the treaty extended to offences not now included in it. He was not so clear that the House had not the power to put criminals out of the country. It seemed to him a mere police power. Surely if we had power to protect our lives and property and pass laws for that purpose, we had the right to say that foreign outlaws should not be allowed to remain with us; still he was not so sure of it and he was all the more inclined to hesitate after hearing the opinion of the hon. member for Peel. He would like to have some assurance from Government that they would take the matter in hand at an early day.

Hon. Mr. SMITH said that while he was impressed by the elaborate and able speech of the hon. member who had introduced the measure, he did not agree with all his remarks. He thought this was a subject for national negotiation, and it had so been declared by Great Britain and the United States. It was necessary first to have a treaty and then to give it effect by legislation. Therefore it seemed to him that this was a subject with which the House should not deal at all. He observed that the hon. member proposed in

his measure to alter a very old and important principle, namely:—To class piracy on the high seas as a crime for extradition, whereas it had always been regarded as an offence against all nations. The pirate was the enemy of mankind and could be punished by the laws of any country. The term "piracy" in the Ashburton Treaty was not the same offence, but was a crime against the United States, created under the municipal law of the country. The crime of piracy mentioned in the measure before the House should not be regarded as extraditable, and should hardly be dealt with by a law of this kind.

Hon. Col. GREY differed from the views expressed by his hon. friend from Westmoreland. Countries that were independent had power to legislate on such a subject as this without a treaty, but in a colony like Canada there was no such power. It was a very questionable point, however, and the view taken by the hon. member for Peel deserved great consideration in this House. The policy of this law was sound and good. No one was desirous to protect criminals from justice. The law had been laid down that where there were long coterminous boundaries between two countries where criminals could easily escape from the one to the other, it was a matter of sound policy that extradition treaties should exist. But it was only possible for this House to pass a law to punish a criminal for crimes committed in the Dominion. His prejudice was strongly in favor of the view that the Dominion had the power to pass such a law. But the question must be viewed in two lights—in its legal aspect and practical application. Admitting that the Dominion had the power to enact such a law, its practical application would be at present impolitic. Instead of operating as a check on criminals to prevent them from coming into this country it would have the opposite effect. If Canada should pass such a law and the United States should refuse to enact one similar to it the consequences would be that every rascal in the United States who could, would make this country the scene of his operations. He would rob and steal here and go back to the United States from which he could not be extradited (hear, hear). Now, if the United States would reciprocate in passing such a law, there could be no objection, but rather an universal wish, to have an extradition law on our statute books. It was fortunate for us that there was at present a Commission in session at Washington which could settle this matter, and the expression of the opinion of this House

Hon. Mr. Smith.

would no doubt influence our representative in the United States to endeavor to secure a settlement of this difficult question.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that even the Speaker seemed to be agreed as to the necessity of some such Bill as that proposed. The country was troubled to a very great extent by the visits of those designated as rascals, and he actually knew of instances in which the police authorities themselves had been employed in illegal acts of seizing men and sending them to the United States for punishment. He did not think it at all desirable that such a state of things should continue, and he was rather surprised at the argument of the hon. member for St. Johns, that such an Act as that proposed would encourage rascals to come to Canada. He thought all arguments of the past might be dispensed with, and the question dealt with on its present requirements. Either they had or they had not the right to deliver up offenders against the laws of other countries. His opinion was that they had the power. He thought the best way would be to pass the Bill, and then, if it should prove that they had not the power to do so, the Imperial Government could disallow it. At all events something should be done as the population was increasing, and crime was increasing more largely still.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER desired to make a few remarks on the subject before it should be submitted to a vote of the House, and although it was generally supposed that when lawyers once got up they never knew when to sit down, he hoped he should not prove very tedious. He considered the Bill objectionable in several respects, but the first question was whether the House had the power to pass the Bill at all.

Mr. MILL—Yes.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Of course, the House might pass any Bill, but would it hold good afterwards?

Mr. MILLS—Yes.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER did not think so. Could they deprive any individual of the right of the *habeas corpus*, or if they could, ought they to do it? The *habeas corpus* was to secure the liberty of every British subject including all foreigners taking up their residence within British Territory, but the object of the Bill was to deliver up these foreigners. His hon. friend the mover of the Bill was a great liberal and a great "reformer," and yet his Bill was in effect to restrain liberty. He considered that the Bill showed great confidence in the Government, as it gave the

Governor in Council discretionary power to deliver up any offender against foreign justice, but though the Government desired the confidence of the House and the confidence of the country, they did not desire the trust now intended to be reposed in them, the trust of having at their disposal the liberty of any one accused of an offence in a foreign country. The Bill could be of no effect whatever, and he was surprised that his hon. friend should have proposed such a measure although he did not doubt that his motives and intentions were good. He considered that the Americans themselves were the parties most interested in the passing of such a measure as that before the House, and that, therefore, it should be left to them to move in the matter. Referring to the Naturalization Laws, he said those laws though passed by the different Provincial Parliaments had never had any effect outside the Dominion, as if any person naturalized by those laws had gone to a foreign country and there got into trouble, the Imperial Government would not have recognised him as a British subject, and protected him as such. The matter had been discussed at the London Conference, when the Imperial Government had given them to understand that on the formation of the Dominion, they would endorse the Naturalization Laws. At present, however, any such laws could not extend beyond the limits of the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS—Quite sufficient.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER did not think it was sufficient. He then referred to the Treaty of Extradition between England and France, under which every British possession was pledged to deliver up to France any French criminals resorting to British soil,—which was altogether an Imperial enactment—and did not leave the delivery of the offender to the discretion of the Governor in Council, as proposed by the present Bill, but made it imperative. His hon. friend had also referred to piracy, but the Canadian Government could not legislate as to crimes committed at sea, and how, therefore, could it legislate as to the surrender of those committing such crimes. The hon. member quoted a statute passed in Upper Canada, but that statute had never been acted upon, and was now repealed. He explained the character of the law passed after the St. Alban's Raid, to show the difference between its principles and those of the Bill before the House. The Imperial Government considered the enactment of the right of *Habeas Corpus* a sufficient protection to all foreigners.

Mr. MILLS—You suspended it several times.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER stated it was done to meet the Fenian danger, and advisedly, by consent of Parliament. This Bill, however, would place the freedom of all foreigners in Canada at the discretion of the Governor in Council. Personally he admitted, the Canadians and Americans ought to extend the extradition law to cover crimes not now provided for. But this act should be preceded by a treaty. Larceny might be made an extradition offence, the circumstances which prevented Lord Elgin consenting to it having ceased to operate. Slavery was no more. Any law we might pass would be confined in its operation to our own jurisdiction. (Cheers.)

Mr. LANGLOIS said the basis of our authority or power to legislate was laid down in the Confederation Act. We could make laws for the peace, order and good government of the country. The Act did not give us the right to legislate on international matters. A thief coming here did not endanger our peace; nor did his presence necessarily expose our laws to violation. He criticised the first and second clauses of the bill, in arguing our courts had no right to try for such a crime as piracy. Consequently we had no right to arrest or extradite for such a crime. He cited the law to show Canada had no jurisdiction in respect to offences committed on the high seas. The Admiralty in England alone had power in regard to them.

In reply to Mr. Mills,

Mr. LANGLOIS stated, the Canadian law officers could only arrest a pirate within Canada, but would have to send him to England for trial. So long as we remained a colony, we could have no jurisdiction in matters of international law.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the legal members all seemed to disagree, and argue from different stand points. It seemed strange that though Canada could arrest, try, and even hang criminals, it could not send offenders out of the country for trial in the country wherein their offences were committed. Such was the substance of some of the arguments to-night. He knew it was intended in the Confederation Act to enable Canada to make laws not only in relation to the peace, order, and good government of Canada, but in regard to all matters not specially delegated to the Local Governments. The constitution empowered Parliament to legislate on all subjects connected with the interests of the country, and necessarily matter of police. The Government hesitated to enact a Bill last session on the constitutionality of which was put at the time an Imperial Act necessitated an Imperial Act validity now or to set

at rest. What should cause such a singular change of mind on the part of ministers with respect to their powers under this Act of 1867. He believed, with regard to the present Bill that the country should not be made a safe refuge for criminals. The present condition of the law was demoralising and injurious. In the interest of the country it was desirable to give every facility to hand back criminals to the parties whom they had injured. He did not belong to the regular Opposition, (hear, hear, and laughter), and could not speak for it; but was surprised at the readiness of some of its members to place such large discretionary powers in the hands of the Government. In the interests of the people of this country some action should be taken in this matter; and if the Government would take action, he doubted not that the mover of the Bill would gladly leave it in the hands of Ministers. At any rate there was an urgent necessity for legislation to remove a class of evils that undoubtedly existed in the present state of the law. (cheers).

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU urged that unless there was something in the Confederation Act giving us power, he did not think we should assume it on our own responsibility. If not as a matter of strict constitutional law as a matter of expediency, we should not embarrass the Empire by giving over, without any consideration, that which was not only not ours, but which belonged to the right and power of the Empire itself. He repudiated the slur cast upon the legal profession in some of the remarks of the last speaker, touching the interest supposed to exist, sometimes, in the presence here and retention of wealthy criminals.

Mr. LANGLOIS moved that the Bill be not read now but this day six months.

Mr. MILLS, in reply, contended it was better to deal with extradition by a simple Act of the Legislature than by a treaty. He thought it would be better to sweep away the treaty altogether, and deal with the subject as a matter of comity, keeping in view the bounden duty of the country to hand over criminals under all circumstances. He went on to reply to several of the arguments advanced against his Bill. He concluded by saying that he believed this country had the power to pass this law, that it was a mere police regulation, and that it was to the interest of this country that such a law should be enacted.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried—yeas, 61; nays, 33.

The House adjourned at 11:15.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, 9th March, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock, and a number of petitions were presented.

THE ARBITRATION

The notice of motion respecting the Arbitration between Quebec and Ontario (Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just) was discharged.

THE LACHINE REGATTA.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU moved—That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House,—

1st. Copies of the correspondence which took place between the Trinity House of Montreal and the Montreal Water Police or any other person, on the occasion of the regatta at Lachine last autumn.

2nd. Copies of all resolutions, orders, or minutes of decision in relation to the said regatta, adopted by the Trinity House, together with all communications with the Federal Government on the same subject—Carried.

THE INMAN LINE,

Hon. Mr. DICKEY referred to the importance of keeping up efficient steam communication between Halifax and Europe, and pointed out the great advantages of Halifax compared with New York, Boston, Portland and other ports. It was very important, he said, that the position of the contracts for the performance of that important service should be clearly understood. He had seen a despatch in a Halifax paper, from the head of the Inman firm, who stated that he had no desire to continue the contract between Halifax and Liverpool. Under these circumstances it was important that an enquiry should be made into the subject with as little delay as possible. The inquiry he wished to make of the Government was this: Whether the contract between Hugh Allan, Esq., and the Postmaster General, made in December, 1863, for a weekly mail service between Liverpool, and Quebec, and Portland respectively, has been renewed or extended, and when such contract will expire?

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT called attention to the fact that Louisbourg, Cape Breton, a port accessible at all seasons, must become sooner or later the port of call for the European steamers, as it was the nearest to Europe, and otherwise the most convenient.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the contract with the Messrs. Allan had been renewed until April, 1872, but there was a provision in it that a year's notice of its termination must be given the company. The object of the provision was to enable the Government to terminate the contract by the time the Intercolonial Railway would be probably completed. It should be remembered that the question of freight was one which was taken into account by the proprietors of steamers, and it was questionable if they could get enough either at Halifax, Whitehaven or Louisbourg.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD hoped that the probability of there being complete rail communication between Halifax and the railway system of Canada and the United States, in the course of a very few months, should not be forgotten whenever any new contract was made for steamers between the Dominion and Europe.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL had given an assurance on that point on a previous day when his hon. friend had referred to the same subject.

Hon. Mr. WARK expressed the opinion that when railway facilities were perfected, several steamers must call every week at Halifax to land mails and passengers for Canada and the United States, and freight considerations would not then be so important as at the present time.

Hon. Mr. McLELAN thought that under any circumstances there would be that absence of sufficient freight for Halifax, referred to by the Hon. Postmaster General. The proprietors of steamers now declared that they ran their vessels at a loss. In respect to the manner in which the Messrs. Inman performed the service, it should be remembered that they received a small subsidy compared with that given to others. He did not know the average length of the voyages during 1870, but he had occasion to make some enquiries during 1869, and found that the average length of the trips was fully equal to that of the Cunard line. However, the Postmaster General would do well to make some stipulations with respect to the class of steamers, in any contract he might now or hereafter make.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said, that during the last two months there had been two of the trips of the line in question running into 16 and 20 days. That arose, in a large measure, from the very inferior class of vessels employed.

MESSAGE.

A message was received from the House

of Commons, announcing that they had passed a Bill to amend the Census Act. Bill to be taken into consideration on Monday next.

PROTECTION OF FISHERIES.

The Bill to amend the Act respecting Fishing by foreign vessels, was read a third time and passed.

MANITOBA.

The next order of the day, for the second reading of the Bill to extend the Criminal Laws of Canada to Manitoba, was deferred until Friday.

PUBLIC PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved the adoption of the second report of the Joint Committee on printing. This report simply refers to the printing of certain documents.

Motion carried.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved the third report of the Joint Committee on printing.

This report contains the report of a sub-Committee appointed to audit the printing accounts, as well as the clerk's report on the services of the past year, &c. The Committee express themselves perfectly satisfied with the prices and measurements, and give their cordial approval of the manner in which Mr. Hartney, as Clerk of the Committee, performed the various and complicated duties devolving upon him. According to the statement appended, it appears that the cost of the printing services of Parliament, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1870, was \$47,570.06, which included the charge for reprinting the volumes burnt in Mr. Desbarat's building. Printed documents will be henceforth distributed to the new Province of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN made some remarks respecting the printing of public documents, but they were entirely inaudible.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON said that the documents had been distributed very freely.

The motion for the adoption of the report was carried.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 9, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:10 o'clock, p.m.

After routine,

Mr. KIRKPATRICK introduced a Bill to amend the Railway Act of 1868. He explained that the object of the Bill was to permit railway companies to acquire lands after the completion of their lines. This they were not permitted to do under the Act of 1868.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill for the construction of a railway from Coteau Landing to connect with the Canada Central Railway at Ottawa.

Mr. GODIN asked for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Insolvent Act of 1869.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT did not approve of the Bill, which provided that the custodian of an estate could hold it until he was paid his fee. He suggested that the Bill be referred to a special committee.

Mr. GODIN assured the hon. member that the suggestion would be complied with.

Mr. SCATCHERD said the Bill was the same as the one which was rejected by the House last Session.

The Bill was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER laid on the table returns of all petitions and papers, relating to the appointment of a harbour master, for the Port of Halifax.

Mr. BENAUD asked whether it is the intention of the Government during the present year to make the Port of Cocagne, county Kent, N. B., an Inland Port, in compliance with the petition of the merchants and principal inhabitants of Cocagne?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the Government had carefully considered the matter, but did not feel justified in incurring the expense.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT wished to know when the papers relative to the withdrawal of the troops from Canada would be laid on the table.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied, that very great progress had been made with regard to the collection of these despatches, and said that during the course of this week they would be forthcoming.

Mr. YOUNG moved for returns of tenders or papers connected with the contract for the construction of a new Post Office at Toronto.—Carried.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) moved for a return of the number and description of arms, &c., handed over by the Imperial to the Dominion Government since 1st January 1870. He reminded the hon. Minister of Militia that last summer, when the change of policy on the part of the Imperial Gov-

ernment towards Canada brought about the withdrawal of the regular troops and a large quantity of military stores belonging to them, from the Dominion, at the time the hon. Minister of Militia led the House to believe that about 40,000 rifles, the property of the Imperial Government would be by the liberality of Her Majesty's Government transferred to the Dominion authorities. He (Mr. Masson) thought it was important that the House should know in what condition the military stores of the Dominion were, in case an emergency should require them to be used. There was a rumour current that no stores but a few old arms had been left, and he asked for these returns in order to relieve the apprehensions to which this rumour had given rise.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he was glad that the hon. member had brought this matter before the House. There could be no objection to furnishing the returns asked for, but he believed the information required would be found in correspondence already in course of preparation to be submitted to the House. He would inform the hon. members, however, that the Imperial Government had made a gift of Snider and Spencer rifles to the amount of something like 40,000 stand of arms to the Dominion Government.

The motion was allowed to stand.

THE ARBITRATION AWARD.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, representing that an equitable and satisfactory division of the surplus debt of the late Province of Canada, between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, is not likely to be effected in the manner provided by the British North America Act, 1867, and that the difficulties which beset the question have been greatly aggravated by the award rendered by the Arbitrators appointed by the Dominion Government and by the Government of Ontario, in the absence of any Arbitrator for the Province of Quebec, which is regarded by the Government and the people of Quebec as illegal and unjust, and praying that Her Majesty be pleased to recommend the passing of an Act by the Imperial Parliament so amending the British North America Act as to authorise the Parliament of Canada to deal by Legislative enactment with all questions connected with the said surplus debt. He said he had heard that the Dominion Cabinet proposed to refer this question to the Privy Council for settlement, but he hoped that the Quebec members did not join or acquiesce in this determination. He saw by some of the papers published in the Province of

Mr. Kirkpatrick.

Quebec that this was the best thing that could be done, that it would remain ten years before that tribunal, which would prove beneficial to Quebec, but he did not approve of allowing this question to remain ranking between the two Provinces. This delay would only aggravate the difficulties which now beset the question, because the balance of population would be still greater against Quebec ten years hence than it was now. Another reason for promptitude was, that, taking the basis of population of 1861, Ontario should have paid a great deal more interest on the debt than was assigned to her. Doubtless her population had increased more in the period between 1861 and 1867 than had the population of Quebec. Thus it would be found that Quebec was losing as to population, while the difference against her as to subsidy was on the increase. If Ontario had about two millions of people in 1867 and Quebec 1,400,000, by making the calculation on this basis, it would be seen that Quebec was losing yearly \$300,000, which should have been allowed her, and that Ontario was receiving that amount more than was due her even on the basis of population. He had stated that the basis of the division should have been made on the revenue paid by the Provinces respectively, and by this test also it was plain that Ontario had been granted more than she was entitled to. The question should be settled as soon as possible, in the interest of Quebec. A delay must complicate it by the increase of representatives in the House, from Ontario, which must result from the increase of population in the Western section of the Dominion. Canada should obtain permission to settle the question of the division of assets and debts and all other questions therewith connected. He was convinced, as he had been all along, that the best plan would be for the Dominion to assume the surplus debt and give equitable compensation to the Lower Provinces. In so doing, they would bring that surplus into the exact position it occupied before 1867, when both Provinces were equally responsible for it.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the course pursued by the hon. member for Hochelaga was the most premature and hostile to the interests of Quebec which could possibly be followed. The motion was mere clap-trap, and was worded merely to command the vote of Lower Canada in the coming general elections. The hon. members opposite had been trying that dodge for the last twenty years, and the result of it all was to leave them in the pleasant position which they occupied, to the left of the Speaker. The motion was exceed-

ingly awkward and likely to defeat the end which the hon. member professed so great a desire to attain. It was an insult to the members from the Lower Provinces, imputing a doubt as to their honesty and fairness. But this was not the first occasion on which the hon. member for Hochelaga had risked the interests of Lower Canada by his awkwardness. He (Sir George) would not consent to submit the legal position of Quebec in this matter to the risk of a decision by a majority of this House. The Government had decided not to take any action on this question until the Committee of the Privy Council had solved the legal point which might be submitted to them. In case that the decision should be unsatisfactory and be appealed from and set aside, another trial of the question would have to be demanded in order that justice might be done to the Province of Quebec. Supposing that this award should be maintained by the Privy Council, the people of Lower Canada would believe that they had been subjected to a grievance. It was incorrect to declare in advance that any grievance existed. He thought he had now proved that the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga was untimely, imprudent, and unjust. As he (Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier) had promised, he would meet it in a fair, open and direct manner by moving an amendment so as to make the motion read thus: "That the validity of award rendered by the Arbitrators appointed by the Dominion Government and by the Government of Ontario, in the absence of any Arbitrator from Quebec, being contested by that Province, and the Government of Canada having come to the conclusion not to act on such award until its validity shall have been determined by a competent judicial tribunal, this House refrains from expressing an opinion on the award so rendered."

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU concurred in some of the views expressed by the Minister of Militia, but considered the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga open to objection, an objection which was fatal both to Upper and Lower Canada. That motion prayed the Imperial Government to put it into the power of the Dominion Parliament to deal with the matter as it might seem fit. He certainly did not think it would be prudent on the part of the Province of Quebec to put itself in that position, as that position would be inferior to the one it now occupied. He believed, however, that the motion of the Minister of Militia was perfectly consistent with the position the Government was obliged to assume in the matter, and he could easily understand why the Government with its responsibility to the country

had taken the steps it had taken, and had asked that for the present the matter should be left alone, but he believed the House, and the whole Dominion, should consider the question, and see whether the existing difficulties could not be removed. Although the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga did not meet his views, and although it would have the fatal effect of placing the position of Quebec in the hands of the House, in which the representatives of that Province were the minority already, and would be still more so after the next census, he was prepared to vote in the direction of the idea brought forward in that motion, as he thought it behoved the whole of the Dominion not to let this bone of contention continue for ever, but to see whether it could not make some sacrifice, in order that the difficulty might be removed. He should therefore move in amendment to the amendment prepared by the Minister of Militia:—That it is highly desirable that the difficulty now existing between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec concerning the division and adjustment of the debts, liabilities, credits, properties, and assets of Upper and Lower Canada, provided for by the British North America Act 1867, be speedily set at rest, and that this House will give its most favourable consideration to any measure introduced by the Government, having this object in view, and involving any aid on the part of the Dominion commensurate with the object itself, and with our resources, due regard being had to the rights of the other Provinces. He then proceeded to say, if the award should be decided to be legal, would the question then be ended? Certainly not. The people of Quebec were unanimous in feeling that they had not received fair play, that the award was unjust, and that the injustice was evident and apparent. He believed in other arbitration cases manifest injustice had sometimes served to make the award a nullity, and also when arbitrators had exceeded their powers, as it was perfectly clear had been done in the present case.—They had exceeded their powers most unmistakably as far as the assets were concerned.—The British North America Act provided that certain assets should be the property of the two Provinces conjointly, and it was certainly hard to understand how, under such a provision, forty millions could be given to one, and only four millions to the other. The hon. member for Hochelaga, on first addressing the House, had referred to the figures shewing the assets given to Ontario, but if he would look more closely he would find that a large number of assets had been given to that Province for which no specific amounts had

been named, but which amounted in reality to more than two millions. On the other hand, a great many of the assets awarded were no assets at all, but were mere book balances of no value. Such, for instance, was the Aylmer Court House, in which case the Province was to receive a certain sum of money under certain contingencies which would never take place, and the Montreal Court House was in the same position. Taking these and other similar instances into consideration, he found that while Ontario, under the award, would receive \$40,241,000, Quebec would only receive \$4,049,000. The position taken by the counsel for Quebec was a very strong one in point of equity, and was sustained by the peculiar wording of the Union Act, which certainly intended that the debt existing at the commencement of the Union of the two Provinces should be taken into consideration. Every one remembered that at the time of the passing of the Union Act by the Imperial Parliament, the saddling of the debt of Upper Canada on Lower Canada was denounced in the strongest terms, both in the House of Commons and in the House Lords, one having termed it “downright robbery.” Without going into the question of law, and particulars of public accounts, he asked the House to look simply at the result of the Arbitration, and at the position of Quebec under the award that had been pronounced. He remembered reading in stories for children of a mill in which old people were ground young, and certainly the Arbitration had proved a mill into which one Province had gone rich and had come out the reverse; while the other had entered with a debt of five millions, and had come out not only with the debt wiped off, but with assets in excess of the amount of seven or eight millions. He thought, therefore, that in all its bearings and consequences the question was more of a political question than legal—and it was impossible to suppose that Quebec would submit to such injustice, seeing that while it entered the Union with Upper Canada with a balance in its hands, and Upper Canada a large debt, at the end Quebec should have a large debt, and Upper Canada, assets to an enormous amount in excess of its share of the debt. He did not desire to criticise the Union Act, as no doubt very great difficulties existed at the time it was framed, but while everyone, seeing the benefits of Confederation, and the proud position to which it was raising the people of Canada, would bless Confederation, yet they must regret the defects in the Act which had resulted in raising such difficulties. The only way now of speedily settling the question, and

Hon. Mr. Chauveau.

the best way of settling it was for the Dominion to assume the whole debt, and if it could not assume that debt without some compensation let it take some of the assets, as the circumstances of the Provinces might justify. In following the course implied in his amendment the Dominion Government would be securing the stability of the institutions of the country, and also its prosperity, and would remove a great difficulty, in which the amount of money sank into utter insignificance compared with the harm that might ensue from the fact of one section of the country being in antagonism to another. He did not desire in any way to blame the Government; he perfectly understood that the course they had taken was the only one hitherto open to them, and he also believed that those members of the Government who were connected with the Province of Quebec had done the best they could under the circumstances, but it behoved the people and representatives of that Province to call the attention of the House, and of the whole Dominion to the importance of a real settlement which would be satisfactory to both Provinces. His great objection to the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga was that it left the question to the Dominion Parliament to be dealt with in any way they might think proper.

Hon. Mr. DORION—Your motion does the same

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU—Certainly not. He invited the Government to deal with the matter in a stated way, and he thought the hon. member for Hochelaga would have done better if he had kept to the idea of the resolutions he had first submitted, instead of asking the Imperial Parliament to deal with the matter, without pointing out any way in which the difficulty could be removed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) said, that as the amendment now proposed involved an appropriation of money, it could only come before the House in a message from His Excellency.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU maintained that his motion was in order, and quoted previous decisions of the Speaker in similar cases.

The SPEAKER read the amendment, and decided that as aid was spoken of the question was certainly one of money, and the amendment was therefore out of order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that he desired to move an amendment to that proposed by the Minister of Militia, that would bring the subject back to the manner in which it had been treated in the Resolu-

tions previously proposed by his hon. friend from Hochelaga, and as the Premier for Quebec had expressed his regret at the withdrawal of those resolutions, he trusted to have his support in the present motion. He moved that all the words in the said amendment after "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: This House regrets that His Excellency the Governor General has not been advised to recommend this House to adopt an address to Her Majesty representing that the division between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, of the surplus of the debt of the former Province of Canada, over and above the sum of \$62,500,000 assigned to the Dominion of Canada, in the British North America Act, presents great difficulties, which have not yet been overcome in a satisfactory manner—but the difficulties resulting as well from the uncertainty of the amount, as from the absence of an acceptable basis for making such division, threaten to give rise to serious embarrassment, and that for the avoidance of such difficulties the debt of the former Province of Canada should be assigned entirely to the Dominion, as if it had been so from the first, compensation being made to the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for the share which those Provinces would have paid of the surplus of that debt—and praying that Her Majesty would be pleased to recommend to the Imperial Parliament, the passage of an Act to amend the British North America Act, in accordance with such representations.—A good many comments had been made on the motion made by his hon. friend from Hochelaga, and, among others, the Hon. Minister of Militia had endeavored to induce his audience to regard the reference to the Government and people of Quebec, as implying a want of confidence in the representatives of the other Provinces, but the hon. gentleman must have been aware that that reference was merely a reason, and a most cogent reason for that dissatisfaction which existed, and which it was the object of the motion to remove. His confidence in the representatives of the people of all the Provinces was shown most conclusively by his principal proposition, which was to bring before the House the whole question of the solution of the difficulties. He did not desire to traverse the ground which had been already gone over, as he could add nothing to what had been stated by his hon. friend from Hochelaga, and he would therefore at once place his amendment before the House.

Mr. DELORME (St. Hyacinthe) regretted that they could not discuss every question without angry words. The real question

on every occasion should be whether the motion before the House was right or wrong. He regretted very much that he was not able to vote for the amendment proposed by the leader of the Government, but he could not do so, as he thought it very important that the question should be decided. It was all very well for the Minister of Militia to say let the question be left to a judicial tribunal, and supposing the matter to be decided against Ontario that would be all very well, but if it were to be decided against Quebec, how were they to stand. He thought some measures should be at once taken to settle the matter amicably.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON (Peel) said the Hon. Premier of Quebec and others of that Province had treated the question as if it concerned Quebec only, but he thought that Ontario should also be thought of. The motion of the hon. member for Chateauguay was simply one of those flank movements for which he was so celebrated, but he did not think he would catch any of the representatives of Ontario in the net he had prepared for them. That hon. gentleman had made a motion which he well knew to amount to a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and he (Mr. Cameron) for one was certainly not prepared to agree to such a vote in this case. His view of the case was that Ontario had a perfect right to say that the award was legal and valid, and they would continue to say so until some competent authority decided otherwise. Ontario had not the slightest desire to come into collision with Quebec, or to take from that Province anything to which it was not entitled, but in every case of arbitration, the award was invariably unsatisfactory to both parties, and that was certainly the case now. If any complaint was to be made against the Government, he thought it should be on the part of Ontario, on account of the award not being acted upon. The Government had however intimated that it was not desirable that the award should be carried into effect until a competent authority had pronounced upon it, and he believed the majority of the people of Ontario were willing that such should be done.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—No, no.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON said, of course he merely expressed his personal belief in the matter, but he thought the majority in Ontario were satisfied, because the effect of the enquiry, if it maintained the award, would be to give them all they contended for, and if that award had created those heartburnings of which the gentlemen from Quebec had spoken, the people of

Ontario would be most willing to agree to some mode of arrangement which would remove those heartburnings. He believed that the two Arbitrators had given a fair and honest award according to their judgment. With regard to the point raised by the Premier of Quebec in connection with the assets, that the word jointly in the Act meant equally, and that the assets could not therefore come within the powers of the Arbitrators. He might say the Arbitrator for Quebec had agreed with the Arbitrators for Ontario and the Dominion in the discussion arrived at on that question. He believed that the present difficulties never would have arisen if the Quebec Arbitrator had remained in his position, dissenting from the award if he thought proper, instead of throwing up the whole matter, and leaving it in the hands of the others to decide as best they might. Referring to the amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay, he asked how could the representatives of Ontario say that they regretted Government had not taken action as stated in that amendment, when they insisted on the validity of the decision already made by the arbitrators. How could they agree to set aside the rights of Ontario under that award without having any decision on the matter from a competent judicial authority? They could not do so. The people of Ontario might be, and he believed they were rather than there should be any heartburnings, prepared to deal with Quebec fairly and honestly, and although they had a perfect right to go to the Government and say you ought to have acted upon and carried out the award that has been made, they were willing to wait till such time as a judicial opinion should be given, and they would also be willing to allow the Province of Quebec the greatest possible latitude as to the questions to be submitted to the judicial Committee, that should be called upon to decide—for the people of Ontario felt that if they were not legally, equitably and morally entitled to what the award had given them, they would rather not have it. Why then should there be any hesitation on the part of Quebec? Referring to the amendment of the Minister of Militia, as to the House not desiring to express an opinion, he thought it should not desire to express an opinion until it was thoroughly acquainted with the matter. The case was complicated in its nature and would require careful study for hours and days before a fair conclusion could be arrived at. He thought moreover that the House should not express its opinion which would not amount to a decision, but that the question should be settled in the only way in which it could be settled, namely by sub-

Mr. Delorme.

mitting it to a Judicial Committee. If the gentlemen from Quebec were so confident that law and equity was in their favor, why were they afraid to go before that Committee? Ontario was not afraid as they believed the award could be sustained in equity, in fact, and in law, but if it should prove to be bad, they would not press its being carried out, and Quebec might rely on their generosity to do neither harm nor injustice and to take away nothing to which they had not a perfect right. He could not vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Chateaugay, even if it had not implied a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

Hon. Mr. CHAUVEAU said the hon. member for Peel had alluded to the position assumed by the Quebec arbitrator, and also to what he had said about the assets, and he could not allow those allusions to pass without a few remarks. He (Mr. Cameron) had not only alluded to the question of the assets being taken into consideration, but to the distribution of the assets, and he said that the terms of the Union Act implied that if the assets were divided, they should be divided equally. That was the position he had taken, and both questions could still be brought before the Privy Council. The disproportion in the division of the assets was most extraordinary. He admitted that the member for Peel had shown a very great spirit of moderation and conciliation and he only replied because he felt that he must set the Government of Quebec right in its conduct in the arbitration. The member for Peel had accused the Quebec arbitrator of throwing up his position at a wrong time, but such was not the case. Their arbitrator had held strong views on the question of taking into consideration the old debt, and he resigned not only because his views on that point were put aside but because such a judgment was given as shut the door to any consideration of the views he held, and because that judgment, by a most extraordinary contradiction, took as a basis for the apportionment, the origin of the local debt. The Quebec arbitrator therefore considered that it was no use for him to remain there after such a decision. He read an extract from the dissent of Mr. Justice Day, confirmatory of what he had said.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL understood that the point raised by the hon. member for Peel was that the whole of the Arbitrators had agreed that the word "jointly" should not be taken to mean equally.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON explained that what he had said was, that the question submitted to the Arbitrators was that by the terms of the Act the assets were set-

tled, and did not come within their jurisdiction, and that finally the Arbitrators had agreed unanimously that they did come within their jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON here suggested that it being six o'clock the House should adjourn, it being understood that the debate should be continued after recess, so that it might be settled.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER thought it much better that the debate should be adjourned till Monday, as the papers being now in the hands of the members, they would by that time have had an opportunity of considering the question, and there being no other important business before the House, he moved that the House should adjourn till three o'clock to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, 10th March, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Hon. Messrs. FOSTER, MACPHERSON, and CHRISTIE presented petitions.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS laid on the table a return asked for by Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just respecting the Post Office at Rivière Ouelle.

Hon. Mr. WARK gave notice of a motion in reference to the amount of tonnage duty collected at Richibuctou.

CAPE BRETON MATTERS.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT made the following enquiry of the Government:—When will the report of the Engineer of the Department of Public Works, in reference to the proposed improvement of Mabou Harbour and False Bay Beach, Mire, in the Island of Cape Breton, be submitted to Parliament, and whether it is the intention of the Government to prosecute those works? In making the enquiry, the hon. gentleman said that whilst he had the honour of a seat in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, he had been the first to call attention to the desirability of improving the Harbour of Mabou. He had presented many memorials on the subject, and received the thanks of the people of that section of the island for the interest he had taken in the project. Since he had given notice of the enquiry he had seen, with much gratification, that an appropriation of \$18,000 was made in the estimates towards the carrying out of that important public undertaking; and there-

fore his enquiry had been answered to a certain extent. He was not aware whether there was any report to be submitted; it was probable that the work was to be prosecuted under the Report which was presented last year. As respects False Bay Beach, he understood that Mr. Boyd had been sent to survey the locality, and that there would be a report on the subject. He had hoped that a sum would also have been appropriated for the improvement of that place, as well as for the enlargement of the St. Peter's Canal, especially as large amounts were devoted to the Welland and St. Lawrence system of canals.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the report of the engineer respecting False Bay Beach was now in the hands of the Government, and would be submitted to Parliament at an early day. The answer to the other question, had been given by the hon. gentleman himself, when he stated that there was a sum of \$18,000, in the estimates for the work. When that item came before the House, it would learn what would be the actual cost of the work. Therefore, in voting the \$18,000, the House would sanction the completion of the whole work. Last year, there had been an appropriation of \$5,000, but the House was not then informed as to the probable cost of the work, and it was therefore thought advisable to wait until further information could be given on the subject. It was now believed that \$18,000 was as much as could be judiciously expended during the current year.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT said that probably few persons were aware of the great importance of the work which would give a good harbour to a long line of coast, extending from Cape North to Port Hawkesbury, and prove a boon to the people of a fine agricultural portion of the Province of Nova Scotia.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented fourth and fifth reports of the Joint Committee on the printing of Parliament. The fourth report simply refers to the printing of certain public documents. The fifth report recommends that Messrs. Hunter, Rose & Co. be relieved from their contract for binding, in accordance with their petition, and that it be given to Mr. A. Mortimer, who furnishes the necessary securities.

Moved that the report be taken into consideration on Monday next.

MANITOBA.

In pursuance with the order of the day, Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second

Hon. Mr. Bourinot.

reading of an Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba certain of the criminal laws now in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion, and in doing so stated that all the Acts enumerated in the first clause had been carefully considered by the present Judge of that country—Judge Johnson—and that that portion of the Act was really of his framing. In addition to that clause, it was thought proper to provide that any person on his trial could demand a jury, composed of at least one half of either English or French. It was also provided that in the absence of a penitentiary, the common gaol, or other place of confinement in the Province of Manitoba, might be used for that purpose.

The Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole on Monday next.

The House then adjourned until six o'clock on Monday evening next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 10th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

After routine.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT introduced a Bill respecting the Merchants' Bank.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill for the construction of a railway from Coteau Landing to Ottawa city.

Mr. PICARD introduced a Bill to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Railway Company.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON introduced a Bill to amend and explain the Act to amend the Charter of the Ontario Bank; Also a Bill to amend the Charter of the Dominion Bank.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER introduced a Bill to amend the Act further deciding the independence of Parliament. He explained that the principal provision of the Bill was to restore the independence of members as it was under the *regime* of the old Parliament of Canada, viz: that the Government could not employ annually, monthly, temporarily, or at all, any member having a seat in the House: Also Bill to amend Act respecting Militia and Defence. He explained that the Bill was to extend the Militia Act to Manitoba and British Columbia.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER laid on the table a correspondence between the Dominion Government and Rev'd Morley Punshon, concerning the appointment of Chaplains to the Red River expedition.

The correspondence between himself (Sir George) and Mr. Punshon was also included (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that every Wednesday during the remainder of the session be a Government day.—Carried.

A Bill from the Senate respecting Manitoba was read a first time.

The House then went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HOLTON suggested that the Finance Minister should make his statement with the Speaker in the Chair (hear, hear).

THE BUDGET.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, in rising to make his financial statement, moved that the Speaker leave the chair. He said I am deeply sensible, sir, of the importance of the duty which devolves upon me on this occasion, and as I am fully conscious of my inability to discharge this duty in a manner satisfactory to myself, I can hardly hope to be able to discharge it with satisfaction to the members of this House. I therefore feel it necessary to throw myself upon their indulgence, assuring them I will do everything in my power to place before this House and the country a statement of the exact financial position of the Dominion. I regret very much that some important members of the House are absent on this occasion, because a great deal of discussion took place during the recess upon the subject of the finances, and by some of those gentlemen statements were made, calculated in my humble opinion, seriously to alarm the people of the country with regard to its financial state; and I felt it my duty myself to take an early opportunity, almost the only opportunity that I had during the recess—of affirming that those statements were grossly incorrect, and of pledging myself that, if I lived to meet one hon. gentleman (not now here) in Parliament, I should expose the misstatements he had made on this subject. Now, during the recess, at a large public meeting which was held in a western county, it was affirmed that it was impossible for any man to take up the public accounts and ascertain the amount of the debt; that the Government knew there was an annual deficit, and that if they imposed taxation to the extent necessary to meet the public requirements they would be called to account, and that therefore they sought to hide the true state of affairs. And it was said, in addition, that on this ground there existed a reason or motive on the part of the Government for framing the Insurance Bill passed in 1868, and

that the effect of it was to place \$4,460,429 in the hands of the Government, which represented a large increase of the public debt from that source. I felt it my duty to endeavor, when the public accounts for last year were presented, to have a statement carefully compiled, showing the exact state of the public debt, at the time of the Union on the 1st July, 1867, and also at the period of 1870. This statement has been some time in the hands of hon. members, and it will be seen from it, that, so far from it being correct as to a great increase of the public debt, the total increase of the debt since Confederation has been but \$2,481,101.71, while there has been, during the same period, an expenditure on account of public works, chargeable to capital account, of \$4,759,335.08, leaving a capital expenditure for the three years of \$2,278,234.79. I think this is a very satisfactory state of things. (Cheers.) In order to remove all possible ground of exception to this statement—because we have had discussions during last session about the manner in which certain items were charged to capital account of public works—I would throw over the public works altogether, the ordinary public works, although it was expressly understood they were to be so charged. Authority was given to borrow money for the completion of those public works. However, I will dispense with them, and confine myself to two particular items, about which there can be no possibility of doubt. There was an expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway of \$1,778,450, and upon the acquisition and opening up of the North West, specially provided for by loans, and which expenditure amounted on the 30th June to \$1,828,877, making together a total of \$3,607,327. But the aggregate increase of the debt was but \$2,267,234. A great deal was said on the subject of the Insurance Companies' deposits. The most sinister motives on this subject were attributed to the Government. It was asserted the deposits or guarantees were not exacted for the protection of the public so much as for the obtainment of money by the Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—I believe that at present very few have any reason to think so, or that it was other than a most desirable thing that in the interest of the country there should have been this protection to policy-holders provided by the Act, more especially as regards foreign Insurance Companies. I only refer to this matter at present because it has been so prominently raised. It was stated in that speech to which I have referred, delivered in the West, and, doubtless to the belief of

every hearer—because there was nothing but cheers and laughter throughout the address—that Government had got hold of all the money required by the Act, amounting to \$4,460,429, while it appeared by the last return, made up to that time, that the total the Government had received was but \$1,837,000. This is the sort of accuracy that characterised the statements of that speech. (Cheers.) I frankly admit that four millions is the amount the Insurance Companies have deposited, but a great portion of their securities are in British Consols, United States securities, and Government debentures of various kinds, all of which produced no effect upon the public debt; so that the amount I have already given (\$1,837,000) is the amount actually paid into the Government and invested in Dominion stock. A similar erroneous statement was made with regard to the Savings Bank. It was alleged the Post Office Savings Banks gave the Government \$2,387,650, whereas they yielded but \$1,859,000. An old story was, on the occasion I refer to, raked up in relation to the Intercolonial Railway Loan. It was asserted the money (\$6,575,410) intended for the building of the road was diverted to Government uses. The same remark applied, it was said, to the Great Western Railway Bonds. This subject of the Intercolonial Railway has been so often discussed, so much has been made of it, that it may not be uninteresting, after all that has taken place to explain the state of the matter. As to the Imperial Loan, the people in England were led to believe that the money had actually been taken to build the edifices in which we are now sitting. All sorts of stories were told on this subject, while the fact is the whole amount of the Imperial Loan is bearing interest and on deposit in the Bank ready for use when required for railroad purposes. (Cheers.) The whole amount of the Exchequer Bonds,—those wonderful bonds,—which at one time was represented at \$6,600,000, is only 339,660, which will be paid out as the Intercolonial Railway advances. I think the honorable gentleman who preceded me in office adopted a wise policy when he paid our debts, some of which bore six and some seven per cent. interest, with money borrowed so cheaply, and knowing perfectly that, long before it was wanted, it would come back from sources about which there was no doubt whatever. Some of these sources are those to which reference has been made now—the Savings Banks, Insurance Deposits, and Great Western Railway Bonds—all of which it was quite certain would be realised in due

course. To have allowed this money to have remained, as it was contended by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition it should have, at an interest of $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 per cent. in London, instead of paying with it debts carrying a high rate of interest, would have been, in my opinion, a most mistaken policy. (Cheers.) But the public debt was not the only subject which engaged the attention of the meeting to which I have referred. There was a serious charge made with regard to the Civil Service—namely: that there has been an increase of nearly \$70,000 in two years, owing to the naturally bad system of government that existed under the coalition. The statement as to this extraordinary increase was a total mistake. One cause of the error—because I will not suppose any intentional misrepresentation was made—was taking the actual expenditure in one year and comparing it with the estimate in another year. I cannot better show the fallacy of such a mode of calculation than by merely adverting to the fact that in the very last year the estimate for Civil Government was \$701,051.66, whereas the expenditure was \$620,348.73, showing a reduction of \$80,702.93. There are many items comprised under the head Civil Service, and unless a just comparison is made it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory result. I am not going to deny there has been an increase in the Civil Service outlay. I do not want to shrink from the admission of the fact, nor from the defence of this increase. It is utterly impossible in a country like this, whose business is developing at such a rate, to avoid this increase. I will take for instance, the Department in which the greatest increase, I believe has taken place—namely, the Post Office Department. Not only has there been a very great addition to the work in this Department, through the new Post Office Savings Banks' system, which alone is a very important addition, but there has been no less, since Confederation, than ten per cent. of new post offices added to the service. In the Post Office service the increase of expenditure rose from \$41,000 in 1866-7 to \$52,000. This is the Department where the greatest augmentation has taken place. But is it possible, in a Department where such an immense increase of business and revenue appears as in the Inland Revenue Department and the Customs, which have augmented at a most extraordinary rate, and are still augmenting, that they could go on with the same old limited staff? (Cheers.) Then there is another Department which has shown a very large increase of business—I mean the Agricultural—with its labors in regard

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

to patents. (Hear, hear.) It is therefore not at all surprising there should be a trifling increase in the expenses in connection with these branches of the service, which I am sure will be found not to have proved in any sense excessive. (Cheers.)

I referred last year, sir, to the very satisfactory position of this country as compared with that of other countries—our immediate neighbors to the south of us, and the Mother country,—both with regard to the rate of taxation and the amount of debt. I will not trouble the House by going any further into that matter now, but there is one point which I think is deserving of attention, in reference to the position of the country, and that is that Canada has in the last year, with regard to its business transactions with the Mother Country, risen from the rank of No. 11 in the list to that of No. 8.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—The exports to Canada exceed those to Russia, China, Brazil, and Turkey, all countries having a very large trade with Great Britain. But there is a very important fact in connection with this, which should not be lost sight of, that there is no country which trades with England that receives from her so large a proportion of her goods as Canada in proportion to her population. (Cheers.) I have ascertained from statistics that the United States with forty millions of people, took during the last nine months, the returns of which I have been able to get, £20,000,000 worth of goods, being at the rate of ten shillings per head of the population. During the same period, Canada with four million of people, took £6,000,000 worth, being at the rate of £1 10s. per head, or exactly three times as much for our population as the United States. (Cheers.)

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Each of us worth three Americans. (Laughter.)

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—When you look to other lands which are put down as being the great countries with which there is trade, British India, for instance, which stands very high after the United States, the difference is even greater. It must be remembered that British India has a population of 155,000,000, and, therefore, the exports to that country amount to about two shillings per head. Russia receives 1s. 6d. per head; Germany, which also stands very high in the list, about eight shillings per head; so that we have the satisfaction of knowing that this country is the one, which, in proportion to its population, carries on the most commerce of any country in the world. (Cheers.) This is a very satisfactory statement of our relations with the Mother Country. I

desire, sir, in reference to the public debt, before closing my remarks on that branch of the subject, to make some reference to a work which I have no doubt is familiar to nearly every member in this House, but which I am sure they cannot be too often reminded of in connection with this matter. I think it is important to call their attention to it at this moment, because the probability is, that at no distant day, looking at the state of public opinion, that works of considerable magnitude will be undertaken, and it is important that people should not be alarmed as to the state of the finances—that they should not be alarmed at a debt, which, considering the resources of the country, I own I do not look upon with the slightest apprehension. I wish, sir, to call attention to that celebrated passage in Macaulay's History of England, where a reference is made to the English debt. In describing the History of the period when that debt first originated, he refers in most eloquent terms to the state of public opinion at various times as to the public debt of the nation. He says:

"Such was the origin of that debt which has since become the greatest prodigy that ever perplexed the sagacity and confounded the pride of statesmen and philosophers. At every stage in the growth of that debt the nation has set up the same cry of anguish and despair. At every stage in the growth of that debt it has been seriously asserted by wise men that bankruptcy and ruin were at hand. Yet still the debt went on growing, and still bankruptcy and ruin were as remote as ever. * * * * * Not less gloomy was the view that George Grenville, a Minister eminently diligent and practical, took of our financial situation. The nation must, he conceived, sink under a debt of one hundred and fifty millions, unless a portion of the load were borne by the American colonies. The attempt to lay a portion of the load on the American Colonies produced another war. That war left us with an additional one hundred millions of debt, and without the colonies whose aid had been represented as indispensable. Again England was given over, and again the strange patient persisted in becoming stronger and more blooming in spite of all the diagnostics and prognostics of State physicians. As she had been visibly more prosperous with a debt of one hundred and fifty millions than with a debt of fifty millions, so she was visibly more prosperous with a debt of two hundred and fifty millions. Soon, however, the wars which sprang from the French Revolution, and which far exceeded in cost any that the world had ever seen, tasked the powers of public credit to the utmost.

When the world was again at rest, the funded debt of England amounted to eight hundred millions. If the most enlightened man had been told, in 1792, that in 1815, the interest on eight hundred millions would be duly paid to the day at the bank, he would have been as hard of belief as if he had been told that the Government would be in possession of the Lamp of Aladdin, or of the purse of Fortunatus * * * * * The beggared, the bankrupt society not only proved able to meet all its obligations, but, while meeting those obligations grew richer and richer so fast, that the growth could almost be discovered by the eye. In every country we saw wastes recently turned into gardens; in every city we saw new streets and squares, and markets, more brilliant lamps, more abundant supplies of water in the suburbs of every great seat of industry; we saw villas multiplying fast each embosomed in its gay little paradise of lilacs and roses. While shallow politicians were repeating that the energies of the people were borne down by the weight of the public burdens, the first burden was performed by steam on a railway. Soon the island was intersected by railways. A sum exceeding the whole amount of the national debt at the end of the American war was, in a few years, voluntarily expended by this ruined people on viaducts, tunnels, embankments, bridges, stations and engines. Meanwhile, taxation was almost constantly becoming lighter and lighter, yet still the exchequer was full. It may be now affirmed without fear of contradiction that we find it as easy to pay the interest of eight hundred millions as our ancestors found it, a century ago, to pay the interest of eight millions."

He goes on:—"A long experience justifies us in believing that England may in the 20th century be better able to pay a debt of 1,600 millions than she is at the present time to bear her present load." Now, sir, have we nothing to show of a similar kind? Why, sir, I had a statement put into my hand the other day which I have not had an opportunity of verifying, but I have no doubt it is substantially correct and carefully prepared. It gives the following figures. In the year 1823, just a couple of years before I came to Canada, the population of the whole Home District was only 21,329, and the entire assessed value of property amounted to \$1,269,252. That district, sir, the capital of which was then Little York, with a population of 4,000, comprised York and Simcoe. At the present time that same division has the city of Toronto, three Ridings of York, two Ridings of Simcoe, two Ridings of Ontario and the County of Peel. The population in 1861 had risen from 21,329

to 218,000, and I dare say, in a few weeks, we will find that the increase during the past ten years had been in even a greater ratio. In 1861 the assessed value of property had risen from \$1,269,254 to the enormous extent of \$69,077,000—an amount not very far short of the whole amount of the Dominion debt. Well, sir, I think we find the country progressing in a very satisfactory manner. This is only one instance, and I believe almost as great progress has been made in other parts of Province of Ontario. I am sure there is no part of the Province of Ontario where one sees greater signs of improvement and progress than in the city of Montreal, (hear, hear). I have not had such an opportunity of judging of the increase in other parts of the country, but there is not the smallest doubt that the development of railways, added to our splendid water communications—that these have tended to make this country advance in a ratio which is not exceeded in any other country in the world. (Cheers). I have now, Sir, to come to the really important part of my duty, but having explained exactly, what the real increase of the debt is—that, in point of fact, although the debt has, apparently, increased very much, at the same time the assets have also very considerably increased, and that the real *bona fide* addition to the debt is, as I have said, something under \$2,500,000 since Confederation. I will now, Sir, come to the transactions of the year which has just closed, as shown by the public accounts. The estimates made by my predecessor of the revenue for that year was \$14,650,000, and he estimated there would be a surplus of about \$300,000. It has turned out that this estimate has been very largely exceeded, that the actual receipts were \$15,612,225, showing a surplus over the estimate of \$862,225. The expenditure, on the other hand, shows an apparent saving of \$544,595.54, but there is a sum of \$209,656.69 which should have been applied to the Sinking Fund of that year, but was not carried to the account during the year, and therefore, falls into the current year, so that that strictly speaking, ought to be deducted from that amount. There are also certain public works which were not constructed, and it is not fair to treat the money appropriated for them, but still unexpended, as a saving. The result of it is that the money is in the chest instead of being expended, and it is strictly speaking, saved, as the works will have to be constructed another year. By that means the actual expenditure was brought down to \$14,345,409.98. The actual receipts for the year having been \$15,612,225, there was, therefore, an excess of \$1,166,816, but from that is to

Hon Sir F. Hincks.

be deducted a further sum. I would remind my honorable friend opposite, that great complaints were made last year, with reference to certain items in the public accounts. There were charges against the public works which, it was said, ought not to have been made against capital, but should have been charged against income. It very often happens that there is a good deal of difficulty in classifying these items under the head of public works, and I have been always sensible that there has been ground, at all events, for complaints on that score. I have, however, caused the sum of \$164,988.18 to be written off against Consolidated Fund—or to be taken from capital account and transferred to income on account since the accounts were published. If any hon. gentleman has got the public accounts, I could at once refer him to the place. It will be found at page 177 of the Public Accounts. There are a number of items, such as stores in excess of issues since June, 1870, amounting to \$36,152.66, another amount on the Parliamentary Departmental Buildings in Ottawa,—that account has always been treated as capital account in consequence of the buildings themselves having been constructed on capital account—but still there are several items in that such as care of grounds, payment of clerks, &c. The aggregate amount is \$39,921.19; and there is another item of the various charges connected with the Welland and Cornwall canals of \$88,914.33. Those items have all been carried to capital account in reduction of that amount; but it is satisfactory to know that there is really an actual surplus of nearly \$1,000,000 on the transactions of the year. I desire to call attention to the manner in which that surplus has been attained, and how our Estimates were at fault. In that year there was an excess of revenue over the preceding year, in the articles of sugar and molasses alone, of \$371,000. Tea was in excess, \$224,000; brandy, gin, and spirits, \$135,000; wine, \$40,000; iron and hardware, \$35,000;—the total being \$905,000. There was, also, an increase in Excise of \$909,594. (Hear, hear.) In this way we got, then, a large surplus for the year 1870. I shall now come to the current year. The estimates for the year—the original estimates I made last year were \$8,600,000 for Customs; to that we added \$950,000 as an estimate for the new duties, giving an aggregate of \$9,550,000. According to our present estimates, we believe that the Customs Revenue for the current year will reach \$10,500,000, giving an excess over our estimates of \$850,000. Here, again, I will call attention to the articles in which this increase has taken place. I stated, the articles on which the

great increase took place in the previous year 1869 and 1870. During that year, there was no material increase, in fact, I am not sure there was any in the great staple articles of cotton and woollens, from which a very large revenue is derived; they were about the same as the previous year. But during the past half year, we find there has been an increase in a number of articles—nearly all staple articles—of import, of which some of the articles to which I have referred, bear a very small part. But there is no material increase in the tea duty; in the sugar duty there is an increase of \$61,000, in brandy there is an increase over the previous year of \$33,000; gin, \$45,000; wine, \$30,000; cigars, \$22,000. There is also a very considerable increase during this current year, on some other articles—namely, on woollens, \$261,000; on cottons, \$126,000; on silks, \$63,000. There is, also, an increase on many other items, making altogether an increase of \$858,000 in the first six months. (Hear, hear.) In Customs there will be a very considerable increase beyond what we anticipated. The Excise will give \$775,000 above the estimate. The estimate on spirits was \$2,375,000, we expect \$2,750,000. We expect from malt, \$250,000; and tobacco, \$630,000; and we also anticipate an increase from petroleum. We expect \$4,200,000 from Excise, giving us a surplus above the estimates of \$775,000. I expect to get \$25,000 from stamps, and smaller sums from miscellaneous items, with which I need not now occupy the attention of the House. The total result will be to give us a revenue during the year of \$17,360,000. In the estimates for the year \$15,000,000 is the sum stated to be needed, but there are some items to be added. For instance, the sinking fund of the previous year, which falls due the present year, though it does not belong to this year. Some balances will also be carried forward. For frontier expenses, the sum of \$119,000 will have to be added. The total sum therefore would be \$15,588,927, as the aggregate estimate. I may here state, that there is some addition to the subsidies in consequences of the new Province of Manitoba being brought into the Dominion, and also a charge in connection with the silver, both of which will amount to \$311,616; so that the aggregate estimate we calculate may reach \$15,900,543. There may yet be some saving. I find there is an estimated saving in the Militia of \$295,000; but against that I am rather inclined to think that the Minister of Militia has a supplementary estimate.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON.—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS.—This supplementary estimate will more than absorb that

amount. But still there is a saving on the Militia Estimates of last session. The estimates for premium and discount will be reduced by \$10,000; nearly all the exchange bought the present year being under par. There has been a saving in miscellaneous items under the head of "unforeseen expenses." In the charges for Public Works, we expect to save \$75,000; altogether we anticipate a saving of \$433,470; which will leave us an annual expenditure for this year of \$15,467,373. That, deducted from the estimated revenue, as taken from the best information, will leave us a surplus of \$1,892,627 for the current year; from that we will have to deduct anything that may be voted by Parliament for the services of the current year. I have now to approach the year that is to come—the year ending the 30th of June, 1872. In the estimates which have been submitted, it will be found that the aggregate amount, including what is provided by permanent acts is \$25,682,000. Of that sum, \$7,846,900 belong to Public Works, chargeable against capital—such as the Intercolonial Railway. Deducting that sum for Public Works there will remain \$17,835,472; and from that two deductions are to be made—one the amount of redemption of debt to the amount of \$1,040,000, which will be redeemed during the year. There is, besides a re-vote of \$400,000, for the North West, which, of course, is already provided for by the Act, as a charge on capital. The aggregate of these is \$1,440,000, leaving the estimates at \$16,394,000. That is a large estimate, certainly, and it is in excess of what it has been usual to bring down. Therefore it is desirable to call attention to the leading items in it, which have an unusual character. In the first place, there is a large item for the taking of the census, an item of \$360,000. Then there is a special amount required for the purposes of the Militia—the sum of \$276,000—not for ordinary militia services, but for the purchase of various arms, under an arrangement of a very desirable kind, made with the Imperial Government. There is another item which is of quite an unusual character, though it will have to appear in the estimates—the item of \$50,000 for a boundary survey between the Province of Manitoba—on the North West—and the United States. There has been a dispute about this boundary, and a proposition was made to the Imperial Government with reference to having a new survey by a joint commission and a joint charge. The Imperial Government, under all the circumstances, considering the independent, or semi-independent state, we have become, has dealt with us in a very fair spirit. They have proposed, in ac-

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

cepting the proposition of the United States, for a joint survey, to pay one-half of the British share of the expenses if we paid the other. Under the circumstances, this was a reasonable proposition. We are interested in the matter, and cannot complain. The Public Works—chargeable against income—are considerably in excess of what is the usual charge. This is necessary, from the construction of several public works, which are urgently demanded. The works are of urgent necessity, and trust will, when the time comes, commend themselves to the favorable consideration of the House. These items, which are quite exceptional, amount to \$1,186,000 in the aggregate. The question now is, what is our position with regard to ways and means. I estimate that our revenue will be from Customs \$10,000,000; inland revenue \$4,300,000; Post office \$500,000; Public Works, 1,000,000; Stamps \$100,000; miscellaneous, \$850,000; and, taken together the aggregate will be \$16,810,000. I have reason to believe, however, that there will be a supplementary estimate which will add something to our expenditure—about \$300,000. My hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Morris) has a measure to bring forward—a new system of weights and measures, the introduction of which system will cost about \$50,000. There are some other matters connected with the Public Works, which we shall have to deal with; and we have some items to put on yet, which will swell the amount. Still, there will be, in the amount of estimated revenue, a surplus of \$300,000. I think, sir, that the statement I have made with regard to the actual results of the operations of the last two years, and my anticipations of the year to come, are very satisfactory; and possibly there are many Members who think they will justify a much larger reduction of taxation than the Government feel justified in proposing. It may, perhaps, seem hardly regular to consider those points before going into Committee of Ways and Means, still I may mention what we propose to do with regard to taxation. It will not be found that there is anything very serious contemplated. I dare say there will be some disappointment expressed by certain Members when they find that their particular hobbies are not likely to be realized. But I trust I shall be able to give reasons that will satisfy even those Members, that at the present time, it is not expedient to adopt the course which a great many are anxious we should adopt. I am anxious, before touching on that subject, to state what the Government are prepared to propose.

The very first step to be expected from the Government in making a reduction in

the duties, would be the removal of the additional five per cent. on all duties imposed last session. Then the next step that would naturally engage our consideration would be those duties to which so much opposition was made last session; I refer to the duties on coal and flour. But I feel quite sure that the House will consider with me that this is not a suitable time for dealing with that question (hear, hear). I think a more unfortunate time could not be selected for taking up that question. At present, as we all know, negotiations are going on at Washington, and it is not improbable that this very question of duties, of commercial relations between the two countries, will receive consideration at the hands of the Commissioners. I, therefore, think that alone, if no other reason could be offered, is sufficient to prevent the Government taking up that subject at the present time. It is not on account of the great amount of revenue to be derived from these articles that the Government desire to postpone the consideration of the removal of those duties, because really and truly if the Government felt it advisable at present to deal with that particular question, the consideration of revenue would not be a serious one. But we may be told "if you are not prepared to deal with those duties, why refuse to reduce the duty on other articles?" Well, I do not think it expedient to do so in the face of the probable large demands which will be made upon us for the construction of great public works, although the subject of constructing these great works has not yet engaged the consideration of Parliament, it cannot be doubted that some of them at least will have to be undertaken. I do not think that it will be contended that the taxation now levied on the people is causing any public inconvenience, or that any serious complaints are being made respecting it—passing over the particular question with regard to the coal and flour duties, respecting which I admit there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction. That being the case, and looking to the future when we shall have to go into the market to borrow money to meet the large expenditure which we will, no doubt, have to incur before very long, we thought it advisable to keep up the revenue so that the credit of the country might be increased, and we might be able to borrow upon more favorable terms than we otherwise could. I believe, therefore, that it will be found a great deal more advisable to avoid taking off any other duties, and more especially as it is within the bounds of possibility and even of probability that the duties on coal and flour will be taken off.

There has been a constant demand by many members of this House, and by various sections of the people for a reduction of the duties upon various articles which are either raw materials, or *quasi* raw materials entering into the manufactures of the country. I think it is sound policy to aid these manufactures in every possible way, and that it is exceedingly desirable to add these articles to the free list. These applications are frequent and they are made very often during the recess of Parliament. We propose to ask Parliament to empower the Governor in Council from time to time to transfer to the free list articles which are used as materials in Canadian manufactures. Of course a list of the articles thus transferred to the free list by Orders in Council will be laid before Parliament within fifteen days of the opening of the next session. I think the House may fairly trust the Government with that power, believing that it will be exercised with discretion, and I feel sure it is a proposition that will meet with general satisfaction. There then was some difficulty with respect to machinery. For a long time machinery was admitted free of duty, but last session we again placed it in the 15 per cent. list. A great many applications are continually being made to us upon this subject. On the one hand it seems a very unreasonable thing that Canadian machinists should be subjected to a duty upon the various articles which they import and use in their manufactures, and at the same time the machinery which they make comes in free of duty. That seems to be very objectionable. On that ground we proposed last session to put machinery on the 15 per cent. list. But it has been represented, and there is no doubt of the fact, that it is sometimes very important that machinery, which is not and cannot be manufactured in this country, should be admitted free. We propose, therefore, to ask Parliament to authorize the Governor in Council to admit free of duty any machinery on satisfactory evidence, that like machinery is not manufactured in this country. Of course any provisions under that head would also be submitted to Parliament within fifteen days after the opening of the session. It will be necessary to provide for the extension of the customs duties which were authorized to be levied in the Province of Manitoba to the whole of the North-West-Territory. There is but one other item at all affecting, I can hardly say the revenue, but the commerce of the country, to which I will very briefly refer. Very strong representations have been made to the Government from time to time within the last two or three years with regard to the necessity of taking some

steps to prevent the destruction of hemlock trees which has been going on. In relation to this matter I may just read a statement of facts as set forth in a petition to the Governor in Council, and I may add that enquiry has been made, and reliable persons have assured us that these statements are substantially true:—"Within a few years a swarm of speculators have carried on to a very large extent the trade of exporting bark to the United States, thus stripping our forests of all the hemlock to an alarming extent. Large quantities of well timbered hemlock lands have fallen into the hands of speculators, who, after taking all the bark, leave the same with the timber rotten and totally unfit for actual settlement. Trespassers, also, for the sake of gain, enter upon unoccupied lands belonging to the Crown and to individuals and destroy all the hemlock timber." Now, there is an extract from this hemlock bark, which is exported to the United States. The United States Government, no doubt very wisely, looking entirely to their own interests, have imposed a pretty smart duty upon this extract, that is, manufactured in this country, but admit hemlock bark duty free. We propose to counter-check this action on their part by putting a duty of \$1.50 a cord upon hemlock bark. This is not a question really affecting the revenue; we neither hope nor expect to get any revenue in this way, nor do we desire it. But it is very undesirable that our hemlock trees should be all cut down and the bark sent out of the country. I may say that while the representations on this subject chiefly came from the Eastern Townships, we received some representations to the same effect from the Province of Ontario. Under these circumstances the Government considered the matter, and having reason to believe the truth of the representations, they thought it their duty at all events to enable the House to decide upon it. It is not a matter that they take any very warm interest in. They believe it is right to make the proposition, and they leave it to the House to deal with it as it may see fit.

These, sir, comprise the statements
Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

which I think it necessary to make, and have only in conclusion to thank the House very sincerely for the attention they have given to me (cheers).

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS rose to reply to the speaker who followed his budget speech, including Sir A. T. Galt, Mr. Cartwright, and others. He said—Before I make a few remarks on the speech of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, I wish to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the last speaker, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), on the question of the public debt. The hon. gentleman surely has got a statement before him of the exact state and particulars of the debt and assets, and he must see that everything is stated there clearly from Confederation down to the last fiscal year, and that the debt has not increased more than the amount actually set down. In fact, it is evident there has been a very considerable saving, as I showed in my former remarks—that the increase of debt from 1867 has been \$2,481,101. I have shown that the expenditure from capital in purchasing and opening the North-West, and in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, has been \$3,609,337 (cheers). With regard to the course of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, I think it has been most unusual; and nothing has been more extraordinary in relation to the proceedings of this evening than the course taken by the member for Chateauguay, who has been sitting silently during the discussion, but who commenced it by proposing to me, as a matter of convenience to the House, that this discussion should be entered upon with you, sir, in the chair, instead of going into Committee of Ways and Means, as usual. Whether the hon. gentleman knew that the hon. member for Sherbrooke was going to propose a motion equivalent to one of want of confidence, I am unable to say. All I do know is, that I would rather occupy the position of the Government than the position of those hon. gentlemen in taking this course (cheers and counter cheers). The hon. member for Sherbrooke took a great deal of credit to himself for his tariff of 1866, and in referring to the

fact that no substantial alteration has been made in that tariff, he said, in some respects there had been a departure from sound principles. Of course I understand why he shrank from naming the particular points that constituted a departure from the sound principle in question—and if the remark had come from the member for Lambton or the member for Chateauguay, I might have admitted it bore an air of consistency, because they no doubt would have condemned everything like a duty on articles of food. But not only did the member for Sherbrooke impose a duty upon such articles as fish and oils, but on lard, tallow, flour, Indian corn and corn of all kinds, meat, butter, cheese, and so forth. Yet this was the gentleman who accused the Government of a departure from sound principle in regard to the present tariff, (cheers). He may shelter himself under the statement that he referred to coal. Is that duty a departure from sound principle? All I need observe is, that I will venture to say that if Confederation had existed when he brought in the tariff of 1866, coal would have been placed side by side with flour, (hear, hear). At that time there was no Nova Scotia to consider, and there was no coal from her brought to Canada. Canada was importing coal from other places, and, no doubt, if we had been in the same position last session, coal would not have found its place in the tariff. Nothing could be more unfair than the observations of the hon. member with regard to the quotation I made from Macaulay's History of England. There was nothing in what I said to intimate I thought it was desirable there should be a great public debt. I wanted to show that, notwithstanding that great public debt—and let it be observed, that was contracted almost exclusively for carrying on war—and surely no one can imagine it is a desirable thing to contract debt for such an object—however necessary it may be to contract debts for the defence of the country—the mother country had increased in wealth and prosperity. But here we are in very different circumstances. Our debt was contracted not to carry on war, but for the noble, the

promising work of public improvements [cheers]. I do not hesitate to say, I believe it has been the means of increasing largely the material prosperity of the country, and of accelerating its progress, [hear, hear]. This debt of ours has not been, as the hon. gentleman strove to make it appear, a serious disadvantage. The hon. member talked a good deal about the tendency to speculation resulting from a debt and loans, and warned us anxiously in regard to them; and he went on to condemn the municipalities for going too fast in giving subsidies to railways, and also the Provincial Governments of Ontario and Quebec. I saw an announcement, not many weeks ago, that the hon. member for Sherbrooke was himself soliciting aid from the Government of Quebec for a certain railway. Yet he now actually condemns it for its generous policy on this subject (cheers). Then, however, he was urging that Government to go even further than it proposed in its contribution (renewed cheers). Moreover, one of the conditions of the Union we are about consummating with British Columbia is the construction of a great railway to the Pacific; and surely no one imagines it is possible that great work can be built without material public aid. The hon. member is well aware, besides, that one of the terms of the Confederation compact was the improvement of the western canals. He certainly, therefore, was the last person, under the circumstances, who should have uttered this warning with regard to the public works. It is not the first time he has talked about speculations, extravagant and improvident expenditure, and so forth, of the years 1852 to 1854.

For my own part I am not prepared to defend all the grants and loans which were contracted in those years with regard to the railway improvements, yet I will not hesitate to say that I believe that, on the whole the expenditure of money which took place under the acts to which I refer, did tend very much to the improvement and advantage of the Province of Ontario, in which the expenditure chiefly took place. If we are to go on with improvements, it

is absolutely impossible that improvements of a larger description can be paid out of the ordinary revenue, but it is really a little too bad that after all the attacks made on the Government from the other side of the House for paying too much out of capital—that is to say for borrowing money for the purpose of making public improvements—when we come forward to say that we have the means of paying them out of our ordinary revenue, and do pay them out of that source, it is too bad that we are assailed for it. At all events, as far as my own experience goes, I have no knowledge of any precedent for this, (cheers). What have we had this evening? We have had a regular discussion on the Estimates, just as if the House were in Committee of Supply. We have had all the items passed under review, and attacks made on the Government which it is almost impossible in discussion of this kind to meet. I certainly feel pretty strongly on the subject, because the hon. gentleman, not content with attacking the Government, has actually assailed me personally as Minister of Finance.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT—No, no.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Yes, yes! I say yes, for the honorable gentleman attacked the mode of dealing with the finances of the country, and said it was my financial policy, (hear, hear). Now, the honorable gentleman withdrew last session a charge of a similar kind which he was making, when he said he knew very well that the Finance Minister was not responsible for the Estimates of the Government. I do not want to shrink from the responsibility of the Estimates, but I do say that it is not a proper charge to bring a personal charge against the Minister of Finance because the Public Works Department or any other department submit Estimates larger than the hon. gentleman thinks desirable. The true way is to take up these items and ask are they wanted for the country or not, (hear, hear). I say with regard to the item of \$150,000 for the erection of a public building in Toronto, I say that the state of the public building

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

there, used as a Custom House, is a standing disgrace to this country.

Mr. HARRISON—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—There is a paltry custom house building that I recollect seeing there twenty years ago that is wholly inadequate for the trade of that city, where such an enormous portion of the revenue of the Dominion is collected (hear, hear). And then the Inland Revenue Department is without any office except a hired one in the exchange buildings though its officers are obliged to collect an immense revenue which, with the customs revenue, is equal to the whole amount collected in the province when the building was erected. I am prepared to vindicate that vote and every other vote in the Public Estimates, and it is not for honorable members to say that the Estimates are larger this year than they were last year. As I have said, we have been assailed time and again when we were not able to make improvements without enlarging the debt, but now, when we are trying to keep down the debt and are paying out of our current revenue those amounts, we are assailed because our estimates are so large (cheers). My honorable friend was obliged to admit, because I stated it distinctly, that the extraordinary expenses were upwards of a million dollars larger this year. There was the census charge. That is very large, and any one who thinks of the immense territorial extent of the Dominion will see that it is hardly possible to avoid incurring large expenses in this direction. Now, as to the negotiations at Washington—why, sir, the hon. member for Sherbrooke is the last member in this House who should have said one word upon this subject. The hon. member said that my remarks were an excuse unworthy of a finance minister, and talked of the duties which affected our own people and said the Government should legislate for them only. But, does the honorable gentleman remember the year 1866, when he was negotiating with the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington? When he was carrying on negotiations there with the evident intention of basing our tariff

on that of the United States? Yet, he is the very honorable gentleman who now stands up and tells us that when negotiations are going on at Washington, and that it is a remarkable fact that a repeal of the coal duties are hung up in the Senate at the present time—

Hon. Mr. HOLT—No, not hung up!

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Yes, it is so. I have the best authority for it. I state it on undoubted authority, and from the latest information got by telegram this very day from Washington, (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER—The hon. member for Chateauguy has only the newspapers, you know, (laughter).

Hon. Mr. HOLT—I happen to know what can and what cannot be done under the Constitution of the United States. A Bill passed by the late Congress cannot be dealt with by the New Senate. It must be commenced *de novo* in the House of Representatives.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—I am not going to enter into all the points raised by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, but I cannot pass without notice his remarks with reference to the West India Commission. I recollect perfectly well what took place on a former occasion with regard to that subject. The honorable member for North Lanark who charged him with inaction was a member of the Government for two or three years after that time, and yet he did not succeed in getting any action taken on the report of the Commissioners. I can only say that I believe the principal recommendation of the report to be very valuable recommendation; but while I say that, while I believe it would be most desirable to have better communication with the West Indies and more intimate commercial relations with them, I am not insensible to the difficulties that have hitherto stood in the way. Negotiations have been going on for a considerable time on the subject, but owing to the fact that Newfoundland did not come into the confederation, the scheme of sub-

sidizing a line of steamers, which would have fully answered the purpose, was thrown back. I can only say that my hon. friend and colleague, the Postmaster General, is thoroughly alive to the importance of the subject, that he has it constantly in view, but he has not yet seen a chance for carrying out any efficient scheme. There is another point respecting which I think my honorable friend should have been the last member of this House to attack the Government, that is the withdrawal of capital from commercial purposes. That hon. gentleman who projected a scheme for the withdrawal of the whole banking circulation of the country is about the last person to make an attack upon the Government for withdrawing capital from commercial purposes. The main withdrawal of capital from commercial purposes will be in the form of the issue of Dominion notes; and really that will be to a very small extent, because, although the honorable gentleman has condemned the arrangement which obtained the sanction of Parliament last session, by which the banks were obliged to hold half their reserves in Dominion notes, that did not lead to any more withdrawal of capital, because if the banks did not hold their reserves in Dominion notes, they would have to hold them in gold, while the Government obtained a very considerable circulation, and really economized capital rather than the reverse. The only way Government could possibly withdraw capital is by the circulation of small notes. In view of the fact that banks are not allowed to issue notes beyond the amount of their capital, and that amount will be reached, as I believe will be found to be the case, without the issue of small notes, it will be found that the issue of small notes by the Government will not withdraw any capital from the country, and will not injure the banks in the slightest degree. With regard to the other alleged withdrawal of capital from commercial purposes, I believe it will be found that the measure of the Government with regard to insurance companies will tend in a different direction. Certain-

ly it will not increase but rather tend to diminish the necessity of investing in Dominion securities. No doubt at the time when the Government had a large floating debt to pay off they were anxious to issue their securities, but we have during the last year been rather embarrassed by insurance companies withdrawing the securities they had deposited under the Act, and requiring us to give them Dominion stock instead. We had a great deal rather they had kept their securities in their original form. Of course, Sir, I am quite willing to give due attention to all warnings which may come from my honorable friend with regard to extravagance. I am not aware that the Government are projecting any very expensive public works outside of those works to which I have already made reference. The principal item from public works which are chargeable to capital in the present estimates is the Intercolonial Railway. Of course we intend to complete that railway with as much rapidity as possible. Many of the other items are for carrying out works which are already sanctioned by Parliament, and which it would be absolutely impossible for us to abandon in their present state. The buildings at Halifax are, of course, in quite an exceptional position, as the Minister of Customs fully explained. We are now charging \$10,000 a year to Nova Scotia for these buildings. We must have buildings at Halifax, and if the present building is not handed over to us, there is nothing for us to do but to build a new one. This will impose no fresh burden upon the Dominion, because until the buildings are handed over, Nova Scotia is charged with \$10,000 a year upon them, which will be about the interest on the cost of a new building. I will not trouble the House any longer. I must say I think the course taken by the hon. member for Sherbrooke is an unusual one, and is a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government. Nor is it supported by any fair argument, because the mode adopted of lumping the whole estimates, and showing so much this year and so much more another year, without going into the investigation of particular items, is a course

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

which I think quite unprecedented and which I think will not be sustained by a majority of this House.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said that since the beginning of that Parliament he had not thought it his duty to address the House on the Financial Statement, on the occasion of that statement being brought down. At the commencement of Confederation he had thought it his duty to make no criticism which was not called for by the strongest considerations, and he had not found in the statements of the first three sessions anything beyond matters of detail. At the last session the Hon. Finance Minister brought down his budget, which appeared to him objectionable in many respects, and especially so in regard to the increase of outlay contemplated, and the changes proposed in the commercial legislation of the country. The hon. gentleman then, however, had only recently been charged with the conduct of the financial affairs of the country, and he felt it better to await and watch for another year the course of the policy of the Government, and then judge from a statement brought down under the most favorable circumstances, what the wants of the country were in the opinion of the Government, and what the means to meet these wants. So far as that portion of the statement of the Finance Minister was concerned, containing the congratulations which he had addressed to the House and country, he (Sir A. T. Galt) heartily concurred with. It must be satisfactory to all to be aware that for the past year and the year previous, the state of the country had been such as to warrant the statements made. He might go further, and say that he had a peculiar and personal satisfaction in hearing those statements, because, perhaps, more than any other member of the House, he had had responsibilities in connection with the taxation, the result of which they had to-day heard, — for the sources of revenue that had produced those results were enacted in 1866, the responsibility of which he shared with the other members of the Government of that day. The changes which had been made in that system of taxation had been ma-

terial, and as he might be able to shew, before he sat down, had been departures from sound principles. It must be a satisfaction to him to find that the results had justified the calculations which, as Finance Minister, he had offered at the time of Confederation. He was glad to find that all the Provinces possessed ample means for meeting the wants of their respective countries, and also that abundance reigned in the Dominion Treasury also. No Finance Minister could produce prosperity, the most that could be expected from them, was that they should place the burdens required for the country in the least onerous form possible, upon the industries of the country. He believed that the former legislation of the country had been practically endorsed by the Finance Minister, who, in showing that he did not propose materially to change the burdens now placed on the people thought, however, that the causes of the country's prosperity must be sought elsewhere than in legislation, and that amongst those causes they might with some degree of truth class the measure of Confederation. To that measure, the policy and wisdom of which had often been questioned, they must attribute the absence of that sectional strife and animosity which had long divided the different Provinces. Confederation by removing all spirit of sectionalism had done much to lift the incubus from the industry of both Quebec and Ontario, and had enabled them to use more wisely the benefits conferred upon them by Providence, had stimulated the internal trade of the Provinces, and had made them better acquainted with each other, and with the resources of each Province. They found that the exchange of the commodities of the East and West had grown yearly, as was evidenced by the establishment of steam lines of communication with the Maritime Provinces, and on every side they saw evidences that the happy day, when the country would be so homogenous as to be truly characterized as one people, was not far distant. It had also helped them to meet the evils resulting from the abolition of the Reciprocity Treaty, it had opened up new

channels of trade, it had raised in the minds of the people the expectation that new sources of employment would be developed, and the people had been found equal to the burden placed upon them, and had shown by their industry and enterprise that they were not dependent upon the United States to such an extent as to be obliged to sacrifice their principles or their interests. They had also to thank Providence for a repetition of a good harvest from one end of the country to the other, and they had to rejoice that even in the Province of Nova Scotia, which two years ago had been represented as being subject to peculiar privations, there was the same amount of prosperity as in her sister Provinces. To the advantages of good harvests and good prices for produce, there had been added a general absence of speculation. The country had not run riot into works that were not called for, but there had been that steady application to the business of the country, which so distinguished its men of business, and the consequence was a rapid accumulation of capital, which was seen in the Bank statements, and in Savings Banks deposits resulting in low rates of interest, and ability to obtain money for all legitimate objects, and consequently great advantages for the promotion of works of industry which were really called for by the interests of the land. There was one subject of congratulation which had escaped the Minister of Finance to which perhaps he might be permitted to refer. He meant the volume of the trade of the country which for the year 1867-68 amounted to \$129,500,000, had increased in the last returns to \$146,000,000, the increase being almost exclusively in the article of products. Such was the state of the country. With a redundant revenue, abundant means, and low taxation, nothing but ordinary prudence and economy was necessary to insure the future progress of the country. Thus far he had spoken in the same line with the Minister of Finance, but he was bound to say his satisfaction must now end. He felt himself compelled to differ

very much indeed from the Minister of Finance, and to speak rather in the language of warning than satisfaction. Listening to the eloquent words that the Minister of Finance had quoted from Macaulay's History, and which he had appeared to endorse, they were almost led to believe that the true cause to prosperity was to run in debt, and that it was not the unparalleled intelligence and industry of the British people, but the numerous burdens placed upon them, that had carried England forward, and it had been quoted as an introduction to a statement which plainly indicated, that the policy of the Minister of Finance was based on the principle that the greater the debt, the greater the prosperity. The changes which the Finance Minister had made in the system of taxation of 1866 were not very material. As to the changes in the tariff, the duties attracting most attention were those carried through the House last session. The increase of four per cent. then imposed was now to be taken off, but it was determined to retain the duty on those articles which were placed on the Statute Book last session, and he thought the excuse made for their retention of those duties was unworthy of any one in the position of Minister of Finance. That gentleman had admitted that no revenue was derived from those duties, and the country cried out against them, but he decided to retain them because of negotiations now going on at Washington. He thought no negotiations at Washington should affect these duties, and if these duties were not for the interest of the people of Canada they ought to be taken off, and that if the deliberate opinion of the House could be obtained he did not doubt but that they would be taken off. He then referred to the report of the West Indian commission, saying that for the last four years the Government had allowed that report to remain in abeyance. He had hoped that the Minister of Finance, from his practical acquaintance with the benefits that would result from a development of a trade with the West Indies, would have seen his way

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt.

to carry out some of the recommendations. He was sure a great deal might be done in this direction for the trade and navigation returns showed that between Canada and the West Indies there was a trade of upwards of \$7,000,000 and the gratifying feature was that during the past year that trade had increased 23½ per cent., while trade with England had increased 8 per cent. He considered this trade most important as giving employment to the shipping of the Maritime Provinces, and he hoped to discover in the estimates some disposition to assist that trade. With regard to the Financial Legislation, the Minister of Finance had himself stated the effect of the measures, relating to Insurance companies, Savings Banks, and Dominion Stock, but he thought it was to be remarked that these measures had had for their effect, the withdrawal of a considerable amount of the surplus capital of the country, and he said that if they found, as they did find, that Government had really in contemplation the obtaining the control of all deposits of capital of the country, the House ought to be very careful how far it sanctioned such measures in future. The Government in dealing with the Banks last year had authorized a circulation of \$9,000,000. A much larger amount was contemplated by previous legislation, and that legislation is, notwithstanding all that had been said against it, had been proved to have been advantageous by the absence of all evils arising from it. Still the Government had laid their hands upon the reserve amount of the Banks as against their liability to the public. He thought the measure, in that respect, an exceedingly unwise one. However, as it had been very fully discussed at the time, he would make no further reference to it at present. The policy of the Government had been to absorb, more than it was prudent to do, the floating capital of the country and the reserve which the industry of the country had at command for the purpose of various improvements required. It was quite possible that during times of prosperity to do this, but the moment the country felt the want of it the effect to the country must be most pre-

judicial. The result of the financial legislation had been to place large cash balances in the hands of the Government. The Hon. Finance Minister had spoken of a plethora of money in the Treasury, but the result of all this was unquestionably to induce on the part of the Government a strong temptation to seek popularity by a lavish expenditure, and to induce on the part of the public a strong pressure on the Government to embark in enterprises which would not commend themselves to Parliament in the event of their being obliged to provide through loans by direct authorization of the House for what was wanted. At the same time, in view of the large engagements which the country had entered upon, in view especially of the necessity of finding the money required for the current expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway, some reasonable excuse might possibly be found for the large drawing into the treasury which had marked the course of the Government for the last three years. But the question became an exceedingly pertinent and important one for this House to ask, how had this large revenue been applied—how had these loans been used in the public service. The hon. Finance Minister had stated that he anticipated for the current year a revenue of \$17,360,000, of which something under \$15,000,000 was to be derived from customs and excise—from customs \$10,000,000, excise \$4,500,000, and from sundries \$2,500,000. He (Sir A. T. Galt) had made some calculations himself and they did not differ materially from those of the hon. Finance Minister. The income was mainly derived from customs and excise, because what were termed miscellaneous sources of revenue were the products of certain services which cost about as much, or perhaps more than they produced. The average revenue must be governed by the increase in the population of the country coupled with the greater increase which might reasonably be assumed to take place in the wealth of the country. The increase of the population was somewhere about three per cent per annum, and he thought if the increase of consumptive power of the country were placed at two per cent additional they would have made a liberal allowance for the productiveness of customs and excise and any other revenue to be derived from the main body of the people. Taking the average increase per annum since Confederation at five per cent, it would be found to be a fair estimate. The country had prospered, the revenue had outgrown the expenses, and we had the satisfaction to-

day of dealing with a greater revenue than was required to meet the expenses of the country. At the same time he might remark without assuming the character of an alarmist, that there was a disposition now evincing itself in the country to embark in public works involving a large outlay something similar to the times of 1852-3-4. Many of these works were undoubtedly of a highly useful character, but he confessed that he looked with apprehension on the disposition on the part of municipalities, and he might add Provinces, to give great encouragement to an immediate attempt to construct these works. He feared that it would lead to a large, and, for many years, unproductive outlay, and the effect would be to sink the capital of the country. The estimates of the Finance Minister were extremely moderate, looking at the state of the country, and there was a possibility of obtaining a larger, rather than a smaller revenue than was anticipated. But they all knew that periods of prosperity without inflation, and unquestionably periods of prosperity with inflation sooner or later came to a close, and he contended that it was time for the House to take stock of their position to see that they did not by their own acts, or by the acts of the Government add directly to the disposition which existed to enter upon a course of expenditure which must in its end be attended by disaster. He had come now to the policy of the Government as indicated by the hon. Finance Minister to-day. Had it been hitherto prudent and economical? Did it tend to repress the speculative feeling in the country, and did it promise more safety, security and immunity from disaster in the future? (hear, hear). To all those questions he was compelled to answer in the negative (hear, hear, from the Opposition). He did not think the policy of the Government would have any of these results. He had examined the accounts of last year, the estimates for the coming year and listened to the Hon. Finance Minister. He found that during the three years for which the public accounts were completed, and compared them with the estimates for the current year, if it were a fact that the Government had been so economical, the question naturally suggested itself, why did they actually require more to be voted this year than was actually asked for last year (hear, hear). Now, the total expenditure for 1867-8, the first year of the Confederation, was \$13,486,000 of which the amount actually under the control of the Government was \$5,586,000, (hear, hear). In 1868-9 that expenditure had only grown to \$5,634,000, or a trifle over \$100,000. The

third year it had swollen to \$6,243,000, not, perhaps, a very excessive growth considering, as was remarked by the Finance Minister that an increasing revenue required an increasing expenditure. But the following year, when the Finance Minister first became associated with the finances of the country, it rose to \$7,018,000, and this year, under precisely the same management, it stood in the estimates at \$8,060,000. (Hear, hear.) The result was that in five years the expenditure chargeable to the consolidated fund, apart from interest and charges on the public debt and subsidies to the provinces had swollen from \$1,516,000 to \$8,000,000, an increase of 45 per cent, of which 30 per cent had occurred in the last two years. Government policy had been to absorb more of the capital and business means of the country than was safe or its interests required. The effect in future might be most hurtful. The result of the plethora of money owing to loans and large revenues was to tempt the Government to embark in lavish expenditure, and to subject it to great pressure for undertaking public works. For improvement of existing canals we find \$624,000; for harbours and piers, \$326,000; for Ottawa buildings, in which we spend no less than \$297,000; for public building at Halifax, \$200,000. Surely the proposition which the Nova Scotia Government made on the last item might have been accepted, and at least two-thirds of the item saved to the country. The Finance Minister had admitted that there was \$313,000 in the estimates for other public buildings; there are therefore in the estimates no less than \$2,000,000 for public works, independent of the Intercolonial Railway, on which upwards of \$255,000 had been expended for engineering alone, up to June 30, 1870 (Cheers from the Opposition.) It has been charged in the House and in Committees that the expenditure on that road has been unnecessarily large. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving, in amendment, that Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be

Resolved, That this House regards the continuous and rapid increase in the ordinary expenses of Government as excessive and uncalled for, and believes that unless more strict economy be observed in the general outlay of the country, grave evils will speedily arise.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he first made the acquaintance of the Hon member for Sherbrooke at the Charlotte Town Conference in 1864. The clear, logical and eloquent

Hon. Mr. A. T. Galt

manner in which he presented to the Conference the advantages of an union of the whole of British America, impressed him most favourably, and he remarked to one of the hon. gentleman's then colleagues, that he (Mr. Galt) appeared to be a gentleman of brilliant intellect and high accomplishments; his colleague replied that to hear him to advantage, he should be heard delivering a Budget speech. He had listened to him on one such occasion, when he had the deficiency of nearly two millions of dollars, and such was his tact and so great was his persuasive eloquence, that when he closed his speech he had convinced a majority of the Canadian Parliament that he was in the enjoyment of a handsome surplus. What a treat it would have been, said Mr. Tilley, could the House have listened to the hon. Member for Sherbrooke on the present occasion, as the Minister of Finance, submitting, as he would have done, the financial operations of the first three years of the Union, and the estimated results of the current fiscal year, now drawing to a close; with what clearness and eloquence would he have pointed out the surplus of each year, reaching in the whole to a gain exceeding four millions of dollars, drawing as he doubtless would from these facts, conclusions as to the future of the Dominion, that would have elicited from both sides of the House loud cheers in response to his eloquent peroration. Not occupying that position, how different is his course. It is true, the hon. member admits that the country is in a prosperous condition, that to a considerable extent this prosperity has been brought about by Confederation, affording greatly increased facilities for inter-Provincial Trade by the removal of former barriers; that the present equitable tariff, very similar, indeed, to that introduced by himself, and passed in the Parliament of Canada in 1866, has tended in the same direction; that this state of things justifies fully the part he took in bringing about Confederation. Yet he sounded a warning note, and by his expressions of fear for the early future of the Dominion, crushed the hopes and aspirations he had previously raised. The hon. member for Sherbrooke endorses in the main the estimates and statements made by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and claims to be in a great measure the author of the present Tariff, but charges that any deviation from the tariff of 1866 has been in the wrong direction, and complains of the imposition last session of duty on coal, flour, and grain. He (Mr. Tilley) was much surprised to find the hon. member for Sherbrooke condemning the tariff policy of the Government, which was so like that introduced by him in 1866.

The flour and grain duty was not imposed for the first time last session, the hon. member was himself the author of that policy. (Hear, hear.) He would ask, have the changes been in the wrong direction? Since 1866, the duty on molasses has been reduced, is that in the wrong direction? The duty on tea has also been reduced, is that in the wrong direction? The hon. member for Sherbrooke in 1866 imposed a duty on flour of fifty cents per barrel, (hear, hear) it had been reduced to twenty-five cents a barrel, is that in the wrong direction? He at the same time imposed a duty of twenty-five cents a barrel on corn meal, it has since been reduced to fifteen cents a barrel, is that also in the wrong direction? In the face of these facts he (Mr. Tilley) was amazed to find the hon. member for Sherbrooke denouncing the Government for the imposition of only half the duty he himself caused to be exacted, when he was Minister of Finance. Great as was his surprise at the objections taken by the hon. member to the provisions of the tariff, it was immeasurably increased by his condemnation of the proposed expenditure for public works, as shown by the estimates for next year, and by the policy foreshadowed by the appointment of the Canal Commission. That hon. gentleman's policy in the past had been to give every possible facility to the development of the resources and the extension of the trade of the country, and had in old Canada incurred a large debt in connection with that policy. And if his memory served him, he had always advocated the reduction of tolls on canals to a sum that would barely pay working expenses, so great, in his estimation, were the advantages to be derived from such works. Nay more, at the Quebec conference in 1864, that hon. member, with his colleagues from Canada, made it one of the conditions of the terms of Union, that as soon as the finances of the Dominion would permit, the Canals of Canada should be enlarged, (hear, hear), this condition, the representatives from the Maritime Provinces would willingly have deferred, but it was insisted upon by the hon. member, and conceded. And now when the finances of the country appear to warrant such public improvements, the hon. member for Sherbrooke warns us against our fulfilment of a solemn contract, [hear, hear], and one which he demanded should be made; was it to be wondered at, under these circumstances, that he had listened to the hon. member's speech with the greatest possible astonishment. The hon. member for Sherbrooke proceeded to shew that since 1869, there has been a steady increase in the public expenditure.

That the appropriations in 1867-8 in excess of interest and subsidies to the Provinces amounted to about, \$ 5,515,000
 In 1868-9 to 5,634,000
 In 1869-70 they reached 6,243,000
 In 1870-71 they were 7,018,000
 And in the estimates for the next year they reach 8,060,000

That he considered the appropriations for the last two years named as excessive, and calculated to create alarm, and if this scale of expenditure was not checked it would lead to extravagance and financial difficulty. He (Mr. Tilley) entertained no such fears, the hon. member himself estimated the increasing paying power of the Dominion at 3 per cent. for population, and 2 per cent. for increasing wealth or \$700,000 a year. The increased expenditure had not exceeded that percentage. Hon. members of both sides of the House, will remember the way in which their applications were, on many occasions, met by the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Rose). How often were they told by him, that he admitted the necessity for the public works and improvements asked for, and that he was only deterred from placing them in the estimates by his determination, to avoid the occurrences of the past, and to keep the expenditure within the income. In that policy he succeeded, but only by refusing in many cases, the construction of works he was satisfied ought to be undertaken, whenever the Revenue admitted. It cannot therefore be argued, that because, the expenditure on public works during the third, fourth, and fifth years of the Union has and will exceed that of 1867 and 1868, that the Government are necessarily guilty of extravagance. He (Mr. Tilley) was prepared to prove to the contrary. The estimated increased paying ability of the people of the Dominion as stated by the hon. member, has been more than realised since 1868-9 and notwithstanding the increased expenditure referred to, the receipts have been largely in excess of the expenditure. He proceeded to name the items constituting the principle part of the increase, they were, first, the cost in the census, last year \$150,000 were voted, this year an additional vote of \$360,000 is asked. This Session an extraordinary vote for Militia of \$275,000 is asked to pay in part for arms, ammunition and stores bought from the Imperial Government on advantageous terms. The expenditure this year and next in the protection of our Fisheries, will reach \$135,000; this is in excess of the cost of the protection of our river Fisheries. The cost of construction of light houses for this year and next exceeds that of 1869 by over one hundred thousand dollars a year. The sum asked

for next year for building and working Dredges, \$84,500, is a new service since 1868-69. This year the Government ask for nearly \$300,000 more for public buildings than they expended on works of the same kind in 1868-9. There is also an additional vote asked for of \$100,000, to be expended on the Slides and Booms on the Ottawa and other rivers. To be added to these items are the proposed expenditure for maintenance of light houses, fog whistles, and improvements of canals and other public works. Then there was the expenditure of \$400,000 towards the opening up of the North West.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT. This is not charged against income.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY admitted the correctness of the statement, but said, that item with the outlay for the harbours of refuge, deepening and enlarging of canals, extension of the railway station and grounds at St. John and Halifax, public buildings at Ottawa and Halifax, though chargeable to the public debt would, with all other expenditures for public works since the Union except the Intercolonial Railway, be met by the receipts since Confederation, and there would still be a million of dollars to spare (hear, hear). The hon. member for Sherbrooke had said that the grants proposed covered expenditures in every part of the Dominion. He (Hon. Sir A. T. Galt) thought our resources should now mainly be expended in the opening up and development of the North West. Would the hon. members, asked Mr. Tilley, endorse this proposition. Are not all the Provinces in this Dominion entitled to a fair share of the public monies. They certainly are. They contribute to the general treasury, and have a claim upon the just and fair consideration of Parliament. He (Mr. Tilley) as a representative of one of the Maritime Provinces, was willing to provide liberally for the development and settlement of the North West. It was for the interest of the whole that this should be done. But for one, he was not prepared to give all to that new territory, and the country would not sustain Parliament were they to undertake to do so. The expenditure on the railways of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would give increased facilities to the trade and agricultural pursuits of those Provinces. The lights in the River St. Lawrence and Gulf, as well as those erected on the coasts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, diminished the risks and reduced the insurance and other charges on shipping, and by diminishing the cost of transport, direct benefits were secured to the whole population. So with the Harbours of Refuge on the great lakes and in the Maritime

Provinces. These expenditures on the lakes were assented to last session. Parliament had always declared that they should be constructed. Surely the Government were not to be condemned for doing what Parliament had declared they should do. Had the income been insufficient to meet these demands, he could see some reason for the objections of the hon. member; but with a large surplus, with means ample, and that after a reduction of taxation, he failed to see a justification for his course, and he was quite certain that neither the House nor the country would sustain him in it. The hon. member had referred to the proposed vote of \$200,000 for public buildings in Halifax, and asked, was it wise to throw away such a sum of money for that object, when the present buildings could be had on payment of \$66,000 to the Nova Scotia Government. It was clear that the hon. member did not understand the position of this question. No such loss as he supposed could arise. Under the new terms with Nova Scotia, the building referred to have to be transferred to the Dominion. Until that transfer takes place, the Government of Nova Scotia are by agreement chargeable with the interest on their cost. If they conclude to retain them, the interest charged against them, will meet the interest on the new outlay incurred by the Dominion, the vote asked, if used, could in no way increase our annual expenditure, (hear hear). Mr. Tilley then referred to the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Sherbrooke. The charge of extravagance was general, it applied to the expenditure on account of the Civil Service, as well as the general appropriations. On the latter point he thought there would be but one opinion, and that hon. member would not be found willing to declare the public works, demanded by the growing trade and commerce of the Dominion should be delayed a day after it has shewn that the finances of the country would warrant their construction. The Government had been charged with extravagance in connection with the Civil Service expenditure, he said this charge was groundless, that the Government had given up a large amount of patronage by subjecting the public printing to competition and by the establishment of a stationary department. By these arrangements upwards of sixty thousand dollars a year had been saved. Was no credit due to the Government for these economical operations? Again, it had been stated that the expenditure for the Civil Service in 1869 and 1870, the third year of the Union, was considerably in excess of the expenditure for like services in 1867 and 1868. Such was not the case.

Hon. Mr. Tilley.

He was prepared to establish the fact, that for the same services the expenditure in 1869 and 1870 was less than in 1867 and 1868. In 1869 and 1870, officers in the Militia Department whose salaries exceeded eleven thousand dollars were transferred, from being chargeable upon the Militia vote, to the Civil Service. In the Board of Works Department several officers whose salaries amounted to about nine thousand dollars a year were transferred from the various public works, and placed on the Civil Service List. The establishment of the Queen's Printers and Stationery Department, by which arrangement the Savings referred to has been secured, has been added to Civil Service expenditure. These with other charges transferred in like manner, reduced the expenditure in 1869-70 below that of 1867-68. These are matters that the House and the Country should understand, (hear hear). He did not believe that the House would sustain the Resolution offered by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, he was certain they would not. He wished to add a word or two about the duties on Coal, Flour and Grain; whatever differences of opinion may have existed upon that question last Session. He did not see how there could be much difference of opinion now. In his judgment it would be in the highest degree impolitic to interfere with that question at this moment. In the Act of last session the Government took power to remove or reduce the duties on coal, flour, grain, salt, and other articles therein named, whenever the Government or Congress of the United States removed or reduced the duty upon one or all of these articles; and he was prepared to state, on behalf of the Government, that should any such removal or reduction of duty take place in the United States, it would be promptly responded to by the Government of the Dominion (hear, hear). He hoped that this declaration would be satisfactory to the House. He closed his speech by appealing to the House to reject the resolution of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, and thus declare in favour of the development of the resources of the Dominion and the extension of its trade and commerce as far as the proposed reduced taxation of the country will warrant (cheers).

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said this item was not included in the increase to which he had referred.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT thought the Minister of Customs had entirely misconceived the object of the resolutions moved by the hon. member for Sherwood. He had not changed the well known fact that in the space of 3 or 4 years the expenditure had

increased almost 50 per cent, and he had not attempted to meet the point of the enormous increase of future liabilities. He maintained that the present prosperity of the country was no reason for plunging into heavy liabilities which might prove most burdensome in the event of that prosperity receiving any check—and that they had no right to calculate on an uninterrupted succession of prosperity. He drew a parallel between the times some twenty years ago, when the present Finance had first occupied that position, stating that on each occasion the country had chanced to be most prosperous, and that the Minister of Finance had then, as now, attempted to carry out a policy which apparently increased the prosperity, but which carried great risk with it in case of a change of affairs. Canada already owed from ten to twelve millions, payable on demand, a very considerable portion of which would, no doubt, be called for if Canada should ever hold a less prosperous position, and although he did not intend to say that there would be any serious difficulty, yet such might occur. The Minister of Customs had said that the member for Sherbrooke had represented the country as not being prosperous, but what he had really said was, that never was the country more prosperous, but that there were many signs to show that reverses might occur. He pointed out that people when in easy circumstances were very apt to make engagements which they would not otherwise, and maintained that there was great danger in such a course. A very considerable portion of any future surplus would clearly be taken up for interest on the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, which he thought would probably cost much more than was estimated. For all these reasons he considered it a fit and proper time to warn the Government and the country of the possible results of the course they were now pursuing.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER opened his remarks by saying that the hon. member for Sherbrooke was so accomplished in dealing with figures that he almost turned a budget speech into poetry (Cheers and laughter.) He had thought him as good at a financial statement as Mr. Gladstone (Renewed laughter.) He had told him once after both had listened to a budget speech of Mr. Gladstone's, that if he (Sir A. T. Galt) had all the English Minister's big figures he would have made a still better speech (Roars of laughter.) He (Sir George E.) thought on this occasion the member for Sherbrooke had spoiled his clever speech by his motion, and had consequently made a great mistake (Cheers and laughter.) In 1866 that gentleman had reduced the tariff from 20 to 15 per cent, which had assisted

in securing Confederation. This change, though it suited the Lower Provinces, was opposed by the member for South Oxford. Some items in the tariff were then forgotten, but it was proposed to deal with them afterwards. Those commercial and political changes produced good results to the country's prosperity. The member for Sherbrooke then received his (Sir Geo. E. Cartier's) hearty support (Hear, hear.) His present criticism related to both branches of the expenditure. That portion under the control of the Government had been stated by him as \$5,500,000 in 1867-'68; \$5,643,000 in 1868-'69; \$6,243,000 in 1869-'70; and \$7,100,000 in 1870-'71. He (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) denied that those expenditures had been, as the member for Sherbrooke described them in his motion. He appealed to the House if an expenditure of \$600,000 to \$700,000 on Public Works from Halifax to Red River was ordinary, or under control of the House. They had little or no option in the matter. A part of this money went to purchase arms and military stores, designed to aid in the country's protection. Could this be fairly called ordinary and outlay? He thought he had made out his case that the expenditure aimed at in the amendment was not ordinary. The Government was to-day ready to prove that the civil service was costing less to-day, four years after Confederation, than it cost before. He characterized the motion untimely and illogical, and that the House ought to vote it down [cheers]. The Government had been so pressed in the past by members on one or other side the House, for improvements that, wanting means therefore, they had been compelled to borrow. This year, however, they presented a surplus of nearly two millions. They now came before the House and asked considerable sums for Public Works. This did not prove an undue expenditure—they merely asked the House for leave to make certain expenditures. They did not ask increased taxation with this object, being in possession of the means. He did not see the House was in a position at this moment to affirm the motion of the hon member for Sherbrooke, and affirm that the proposed expenditures should not be undertaken. The hon. member for Sherbrooke was right as to the pleasant results of Confederation, one of which was that we had a plethora of money. The Local Government also had an abundance of money (hear hear.)

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT replied to speeches which had just been delivered by hon. members of the Government. With respect to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Customs, he would say that he (Sir A. T. Galt) complained of the increase of

the coal for maintenance of lighthouses and not of expenditure for constructing them. The point in his (Sir A. T. Galt's) speech to which objection was principally taken was that he was not justified in alleging that the portion of expenditure which was under the control of the Government had increased in an appreciable degree. In fact, his hon. friend had remarked that it was even less, but he (Sir A. T. Galt) would put it on the most favourable ground for the Government, and say that they maintained that the expenditures had not increased in any appreciable degree. On that point he joined issue with his hon. friend, and he did so on the authority of the Public Accounts and the estimates. Of course he had no other authority on which he could proceed. From them he ascertained the fact that for the past year the amount expended for the Civil Government was \$594,000 (fractions omitted). In that amount there was an unusually large sum for contingencies—a very unusually large sum—so large that when the attention of the Government was called to it they reduced it to the satisfactory amount mentioned by his hon. friend. They remedied the evil, it was true, but did not apply themselves to the reduction of other expenses, for in the estimates brought down this year, for Civil Government \$675,000 was required, showing an increase of \$80,000. The administration of Justice had increased from \$291,000 last year, to \$335,000 this year. Police had been reduced from \$49,000 to \$45,000. Penitentiaries and Prison Inspection, which was more or less under the control of the Government, which was \$209,000 last year, was \$289,000 in the estimates. (Here the hon. gentleman mentioned a large number of items in which a considerable increase had been made). He thought that these figures bore him out, even with the explanations which had been made, bore out the words of the resolution that, "the increase had been continuous and rapid," and justified him in the course that he had taken. He thought it was fairer to the House, the country and the Government that he should have made this attack upon the financial policy of the Government, that the House and country might hear both sides of the question. As for the vote on the motion, he was not sanguine that it would be in his favour, but, at the same time, he did hope that, having called the attention of the Government to this matter, that advantages would flow from it. He was only blaming the Government in time to remedy the evils which the country had hitherto been suffering under.

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

Mr. OLIVER had listened to the statements of the Finance Minister and of the hon. gentlemen who followed him, and must express his conviction that the former had not answered a single charge made against his policy.

Mr. OLIVER said he did not consider that the Finance Minister had refuted a single one of the statements lately made at a meeting in western Ontario.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Oh! oh!

Mr. OLIVER repeated his statement.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he would beg to interrupt the hon. gentleman and tell him that he had shown that all figures given there were absolutely false by millions of dollars. (Cheers.)

Mr. OLIVER proceeded to show the immense increase that had taken place in the trade of the country.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS replied to the arguments of the hon. member for Sherbrooke and the last speaker. These gentlemen must see by the statement that the debt has not increased, but there has been a considerable reduction. He had shown that there had been an expenditure in capital of 3,729,000. With regard to the course taken by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, it was a very extraordinary course, as was also that of the hon. member for Chateauguay, who had agreed with him (Sir Francis) that the budget speech should be delivered with the Speaker in the Chair. Whether that hon. gentleman knew that hon. member for Sherbrooke intended to move an amendment which was equivalent to a vote of want of confidence, he (Sir Francis Hincks) did not know, but he could say that he would rather be in the position which the Government now occupied than that held by those gentlemen who opposed him (hear, hear). The hon. member for Sherbrooke had attacked the Government for their tariff policy, but he contended that that hon. gentleman had himself endorsed changes which the Government had made of late years. He (Sir A. T. Galt) had taken great credit to himself for his tariff of 1866, and he believed that he (Sir A. T. Galt) would have put a duty on coal at that time, if there had been Confederation. He [Sir A. T. Galt] had spoken of assistance rendered by the Government to railways, yet he himself had pressed on the Quebec Government to assist a certain railway in which he was interested, and had actually asked them to go further than they intended to (hear, hear). He thought (Sir A. T. Galt) was the last person who ought to warn the Government against Public Works (hear, hear.) He (Hon. Sir Francis

Hincks) did not hesitate to say that the expenditure of money made under the Acts of 1852 and 1854, had tended very much to develop and encourage the resources of Ontario, where that expenditure had been principally laid out. He (Sir A. T. Galt) had said that extravagancies had principally began when he (Sir Francis Hincks) came into office. He would not shrink from the responsibility of the estimates, but he did not think that the expenditure on those Public Works ought to be charged on the Minister of Finance and on his financial policy (hear, hear). With regard to what the hon. member for Sherbrooke, had said about the West India commission he could only say that the recommendation of the report was a valuable one. There was another point on which that hon. gentleman had been inconsistent on the question of withdrawing capital for commercial purposes. That hon. gentleman himself had been the very one who wished to withdraw the entire bank circulation from the country. (Hear, hear.) The only withdrawal of capital which would be made by this Government would be in the shape of Dominion notes. With regard to the other withdrawal of capital for commercial purposes he was sure that the Government's policy with regard to Insurance Companies would rather have an opposite tendency, and diminish the necessity of investing money in Dominion securities. He (Sir Francis) was quite willing to accept all warnings delivered by the hon. gentleman with regard to extravagance, but he was not aware that there had been any undue extravagance, the only item of large amount being for Intercolonial Railways. He must say that the course taken by the hon. member for Sherbrooke was an extraordinary one, and amounted to nothing else than a vote of want of confidence without any arguments to support it, (cheers).

Hon. Mr. HOLTON replied very briefly to the Finance Minister, and denied that there had been any unfair collision between himself and the hon. member for Sherbrooke, when he moved that the financial statement should be delivered with the Speaker in the chair. He criticised the Budget speech.

Mr. JONES (Leeds and Grenville) complained that the member for Sherbrooke had not given his charges in detail. He complimented the present Finance Minister, who he said was the ablest occupant of the position since he had been member for the House. He (Mr. Jones) recollected when the hon. member for Sherbrooke was Finance Minister, that he used to make glowing state-

ments at the beginning of each year, but his speeches always foreshadowed a deficit.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—And you went on to support him all along.

Mr. JONES (Leeds and Grenville) said he had once been inclined to support the Government, of which the member for Chateauguay had been a member, but he was not able to bring down a budget at all (great laughter.)

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS wished to explain that he was not actually aware that negotiations on the tariff question were going on at Washington.

After some unimportant remarks from Hon. Mr. Holton, a division was taken on motion of Sir A. T. Galt, which was lost. Yeas, 35; nays, 91; majority for Government, 55.

YEAS.—Messrs. Bechard, Bourassa, Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Coupai, Delorme, Dorion, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Holton, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Kempt, MacDonald (Glenarry), McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Scatcherd, Snider, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wells, and Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.)—35.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbot, Anglin, Archambault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bolton, Bowell, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier (Sir George Et.), Cayley, Chauveau, Chipman, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Grant, Gray, Grover, Harrison, Heath, Hincks (Sir Francis), Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Keeler, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Savary, Sriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith, Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Willson, and Wright (Ottawa County).—91.

The original motion was then carried, and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. STREET in the Chair.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said, there could be no debate on the first resolution

Mr. Jones.

for the abolition of the duty of 5 per cent imposed last session. He would explain that if there really had not been a mine sprung on him by the member for Chateauguay, he at least, thought there had and he believed the House thought so.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON favoured the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was then carried, and the Committee rose and reported and asked leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, March 13, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 6 o'clock.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Hon. Mr. MILLER gave notice that on Wednesday next he would enquire of the Government whether it is their intention to introduce a measure during the present session of Parliament to equalize the salaries of the Superior Judges in all the Provinces, by placing the Judges of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick on the same footing with those in Ontario and Quebec. Also, on Thursday, whether it is their intention to take steps during the present session to equalize the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces.

THE NORTH SHORE R. R.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a Bill to authorize the Minister of Public Works to exempt the North Shore Railway Company from the obligation to build draw bridges over navigable rivers.

ADJOURNMENT.

The orders of the day were then deferred until the following day, and the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 13th 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:20 p. m.

After routine.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT introduced an Act to comprise in one Act the financial affairs of the Great Western Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY presented the returns of grain and flour imported into the Dominion in 1870.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS presented the returns of the total quantity of sterling

exchange purchased by the Dominion Government in 1870.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN laid on the table returns to an address for correspondence and other information in regard to the bridge over the Lachine Canal, the report of the Engineer of Public Works, etc.; also the correspondence and papers, including the tenders in connection with the construction of the harbours on Lakes Erie and Huron since the last returns; and correspondence and papers in respect to the survey of the Harbour of Refuge at Rimouski.

Hon. JOS. HOWE brought down returns relative to Manitoba.

Mr. RENAUD asked why the Postmaster of Kingston, County of Kent, N. B., does not receive a fixed salary as the other Postmasters of the Province?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied that the Postmaster General was not aware of the difference between the position of the Postmaster referred to, and all other Postmasters, and if any such difference did exist, the hon. member would be good enough to explain it for the information of the Government.

Mr. RENAUD asked why Dr. Wilson does not receive the same salary as his predecessor for his services as physician to the Marine Hospital of Richibucto, County of Kent, N. B.?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—Dr. Wilson was informed, before his appointment to the office which he holds, of the salary that the Government would be able to give, and that the salary was arranged after the best information that could be obtained as to the amount of duties required was procured. He was duly notified of the salary he was to receive and he accepted with the full knowledge on this point.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked whether the Government have taken measures to secure the fortnightly mail communication between Liverpool and Halifax, in consequence of the intention of the Inman Line to terminate their contract after the 17th June next?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied that the Postmaster General had already invited tenders from the Cunard, Inman and Allan lines of steamers for the service referred to.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN, in reply to Mr. Ross (Victoria, N. S.) said that a sum of money had been included in the estimates for the current year for the repairing of the St. Peter's Canal.

Mr. STREET then moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions: 1. That it

is expedient that power be given to attach ships and vessels for provisions furnished and repairs made to them by a summary process. 2. That where there is no Admiralty Court of Admiralty Jurisdiction, such process shall issue out of the County Court or Court of inferior jurisdiction. 3. That under such process proceedings may be had to judgment, and ships or vessels so attached may be sold thereupon. 4. That a Bill should be founded on these resolutions with the necessary forms of procedure thereon. He said, where the Admiralty law was not in existence or force, no lien could be given on a vessel for repairs thereto or provisions furnished it. There was therefore no remedy provided for parties thus serving vessels. It seemed but just and reasonable that the whole country should be placed under a law which would enable all who repaired or supplied vessels to recover what was due to them. Therefore he proposed a system of summary jurisdiction in cases where no Admiralty law existed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said the principle advocated had been repudiated by the British Parliament. This principle, or proposal, had never received the support of public opinion, because it would place the owners of ships entirely in the hands of masters of vessels, who might take advantage of them by running up accounts, or incurring dangerous responsibilities in foreign ports or under other circumstances (hear, hear.)

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said such progress was making in the Imperial Legislature in the amendment of the law on this subject, as gave hope of an early remedy of the evil here complained of.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the subject had not failed to engage the attention of the Government some time ago. The member for Halifax did not seem rightly to apprehend the apparent object of these resolutions, which was to extend to the inland waters of Ontario, the principle which now applied to all sea-going vessels and not to extend or alter in any way the maritime jurisdiction outside of that. The subject was dropped for the present in consequence of an application from the Imperial authorities not to proceed with the legislation we contemplated, until a measure now before the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of consolidating the navigation laws has been dealt with, so that a more perfect accord should be established between the two systems. Government also intended, when that measure was brought forward, to embody in it a clause by which the same facilities now enjoyed in other parts of the world would be provided as to the inland waters of

Ontario. He hoped the matter would be left in abeyance till the Imperial laws were consolidated.

Hon. Col. GRAY thought the object of the resolutions could be attained by an appeal to the Imperial authorities to appoint an Admiralty Judge and Court for this particular purpose. There could be no doubt the great Lake trade, and the superior facilities enjoyed in the United States for the settlement of such disputes, pointed out the necessity for some similar jurisdiction in Canada for the benefit of its inland shipping. The Imperial Acts had extended the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Courts in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. But later an Imperial Act had been passed, conferring Admiralty jurisdiction on the County Courts. He thought the only question that would arise when the resolutions came to be discussed would be, not so much as to the propriety of adopting some principle of the character before us, as to the best mode to be selected. The question was, whether it would not be proper to confine questions of such magnitude entirely to the County Courts, whether it would not be better to create an Admiralty jurisdiction in Ontario, similar to that possessed either in Quebec, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and thus secure throughout the whole of these Provinces uniformity of practice and decisions. It was by no means necessary to adopt all the voluminous forms of the English courts. It might, however, be desirable to adopt the simplicity of form existing in the Courts of the New States. He did not think there could be any doubt about the propriety of the provisions of the Imperial Act and the propriety of adopting those provisions here. He felt satisfied that some additional remedy should be given to merchants who supplied vessels on the lakes.

Hon. Mr. DORION spoke at some length of the want of uniformity in the laws relating to this subject. He referred to a case which had lately occurred, in which the Lower Canada Judges differed very widely in opinion from the Judges of Ontario. He believed that the whole law respecting liens and mortgages on vessels should be overhauled at the earliest moment and rearranged by further legislation, so as to settle those points as to what ought to be a lien upon a vessel, and the proper way of enforcing the law. Very great confusion existed in Quebec on the subject. Some persons held that the sale of a vessel for a debt of \$10 could annul all mortgages; others, that the first mortgage creditor was the only one who could enforce the sale of a vessel; others, that all the mortgage creditors had equal rights; and

the result was that the greatest confusion prevailed, to the detriment of the owners of vessels. The insecurity of the law prevented them from borrowing money upon their vessels at favourable rates.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER said the Dominion Government had in contemplation a measure to meet the difficulty complained of, but they had been requested to suspend any legislation with regard to inland navigation, as the Imperial Government had proposed to introduce a Bill in the British Parliament to apply the same laws to vessels on inland waters as to sea-going vessels. He was very glad that this discussion had taken place, because the Government would seize the opportunity again to remind the Imperial Government of the necessity of passing the Act as soon as possible.

Mr. HARRISON said he had no doubt that the object of the mover of these resolutions was to draw attention to the present state of the law relating to vessels on inland waters in Ontario. There was no Admiralty jurisdiction in the West at the present day. There was no doubt that there was a necessity for such jurisdiction. The people of the United States recognized the importance of having a Court for the settlement of such difficulties, and and while we, on the Northern side of the lakes, had no admiralty jurisdiction at all, still we had an excellent law applicable to such cases. We had power to make claims concerning trade and navigation, and there should be a unification of those laws without delay. Having obtained this expression of opinion on the subject from the Government, he had no doubt that the mover of the resolutions would withdraw them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said under the law of England, a ship was not attached for debt when the owner resided in the country. Supplies were supposed to be furnished vessels on the credit of the owner. The law, however, was different when the ship owner was a non-resident in the country.

Mr. STREET was glad that the matter had been so well received by the House. His object was to give security to merchants furnishing supplies to vessels. He proposed to do so through the county courts, but it was a matter of little importance to him how it was done so long as the security was given. Having heard the announcement of the Government, he would ask leave to withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought the hon. member had proposed a very simple plan to give jurisdiction to ordinary courts in such cases. If the hon. gentleman was

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

satisfied to wait for the slow action of the Imperial Government and the slow action of the Dominion Government afterwards, he would have to wait a long time. The constitution which we had and the power and authority given to us by that constitution, was quite large enough to enable us to deal with questions of this kind, and even larger, so far as we were concerned as a people. He admitted that we should follow in the train of the Imperial Government in regard to sea-going vessels, but, with respect to internal navigation, it was a matter for discussion and legislation in this country alone. The hon. member for St. John [Col. Gray] had proposed to establish a new court, with a new judge, and new machinery throughout. Now, he [Mr. Macdougall] thought that the people of this country would feel satisfied that the courts at present in existence were sufficient to manage such matters.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS thought the Government ought to be credited with being sincere in the matter. The Imperial Government had been engaged for some time in the consolidation of the laws respecting merchant shipping, which were exceedingly voluminous, and had expressly requested the Canadian Government to delay passing any measure on the subject pending the action in the Imperial Parliament, and for this reason, although the Minister of Marine had already prepared a Bill, the Government did not think it advisable to introduce it.

Hon. Col. GRAY referred to the remarks of the member for Lanark, and said that the Imperial Act provided that one of the Judges of the existing Courts would be appointed, so that the necessary machinery was already in existence.

The motion was then withdrawn.

ARBITRATION.

The adjourned debate on this matter was then taken up, the motions before the House being Mr. Dorion's motion with the amendment of Sir George E. Cartier, and Hon. Mr. Holton.

Mr. BELLEROSE addressed the House in French. He thought that the action of the members for Hochelaga and Chateauguay was most injudicious, and was sorry that while they seemed to desire to stand first in advocating the interests of Quebec, they had represented her case so badly. Their motions could neither receive the support of the majority of the House or of the majority of the members for Quebec, which they must have well known. He then stated the reasons why those motions could not be entertained, maintaining that if they were carried, Quebec would be ten

times worse off than at present. He did not fear any act of injustice to Quebec, as the question would be settled by a learned and liberal tribunal, the Privy Council, and further, Quebec could not possibly suffer any lasting injustice while she had sixty-five representatives firmly united in her interests, and indeed he was sure no Ministry could act unjustly in this matter and stand. The amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay, though plain, and proposing something very simple, he was sorry to say was not proposed with the object of benefiting Quebec. He considered it rather designed to create political effect outside the House, and that it mingled good principles with doubtful modes of procedure, and while it pretended to be in the interest of Quebec, it might be productive of serious harm. He had intended to propose an amendment, but in the face of one having been already moved out of order, and of the doubtful regularity of the others, he was not sure that he could do so with any good result.

The SPEAKER here asked permission to amend the Journals of the House, with respect to the reason of Hon. Mr. Chauveau's amendment in the previous part of the discussion having been ruled out of order. His reason for so ruling was, not that it involved an expenditure of money, and ought, therefore, to have originated in a message from His Excellency, as advanced by the member for Bothwell, but that it involved an increase of the public debt, and should therefore have originated in a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ROSS, of Champlain, condemned the award as unjust, and set forth his reasons for arriving at that conclusion. He thought the unfair character of the decision being acknowledged, there should be no difficulty in the Provincial Governments arriving at a basis of common action for an amicable and proper settlement of the difficulty. He condemned the motion of the member for Hochelaga, as calculated to do Quebec more harm than good. He was not prepared to vote for the motion of the member for Chateauguay, which amounted to one of want of confidence. The Government by not recognizing the award, had done all they could under the circumstances, to set it aside and bring the difficulty to a happy termination. He could not support the motion, but would vote for the amendment of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON—I regret to find that the discussion as to the Arbitration between Ontario and Quebec has been again and again, during this Session, forced on the attention of the House. I cannot help feeling that until the questions of law in-

volved are determined by some competent tribunal the discussion is premature. Entertaining these views, I have hitherto refrained from taking part in the debate. But, sir, while I have done so, members representing constituencies in the Province of Quebec, have persistently asserted not only the illegality of the award but its injustice, and have endeavoured to fortify their positions by all the arguments in their power. I now find that these arguments if longer left unanswered by members of Ontario, may damage the position of our Province in the eyes of our friends from the Maritime Provinces. We do not wish it to be understood that we assent to the proposition that the award is either illegal or unjust, we cannot do so, Sir; and in order that our reasons for not doing so may be placed before the House and the country, I shall claim the indulgence of the House for a short time. The views that I intend to express are my own views as a member from Ontario, but I believe I can say that they are shared by a great many members from that Province.

I admit that the award is signed by only two of the three Arbitrators appointed, that the award was made in the absence of Judge Day, and that it deals with assets mentioned in the fourth schedule of the Union Act. But I deny that for any of these reasons it is an invalid award. I also deny that Colonel Gray, when appointed, was a resident of Ontario, or is now a resident of Ontario within the meaning of the British North America Act. It is on these grounds that the award has been attacked by the gentlemen who have spoken against it. I admit that Upper Canada entered the Union with Lower Canada having a debt of about \$5,000,000, and that in the allotment of assets the larger portion of apparent face value has been assigned to Ontario, but I deny that for either of these reasons the award is unjust. My denial, however, Sir, will amount to nothing unless I am prepared to advance arguments in support of my position. I have, I think, fairly stated the position of those who differ from me, and before proceeding to the argument of the questions involved shall briefly refer to some facts.

It is true that Upper Canada, in 1840, had a population of little more than 400,000, while Lower Canada had a population exceeding 600,000, and it is true that while having this small population Upper Canada had the large debt of \$5,000,000 as against a small debt of Lower Canada or as against a claimed credit of \$180,000 on the part of Lower Canada. But for what was our debt contracted? It was for the construction of the St. Lawrence Canals, the

Welland Canal, the Kingston Penitentiary, for Light-houses and for other works which, at the time of the Union, were as much beneficial to Lower as to Upper Canada. It was not the case of a debt without an asset (hear). But it was a debt represented by valuable assets, all of which were brought by us into the Union (hear, hear). While Lower Canada brought into the Union public works valued at little more than \$1,000,000, we brought in public works of the value of about \$4,000,000 [hear, hear]. These assets by the Act of Union became the property of the Union. It never, at that time, entered into the contemplation of any one to take from Upper Canada its assets and without paying for its assets to charge it with the whole debt incurred in their creation. On the contrary, I find these words in resolutions passed in 1839, by the Special Council of Lower Canada, "that regard being had to the nature of the public debt of Upper Canada, and the objects for which it was principally constructed by the improvement of internal communications alike useful and beneficial to both Provinces, it would be just and reasonable that such part of the said debt as had been constructed for this object should be chargeable on the revenue of both Provinces" (hear, hear). Why, sir, if it were intended that Upper Canada should have been charged with this debt, surely some provision would have been made for the restoration of the assets. But what do we find? The Union Act (3 & 4 Vic.) created a consolidated fund, charged it with the payment of the debt of the Provinces made the public works of both Provinces the property of the Union, contained no provision for charging either Province with interest on its debt, contained no provision for the payment to either Province of interest for the use of its Public Works, contained no provisions whatever for keeping an account of the contributions of either Province to the Revenue; contained nothing whatever which points to a partnership of any kind, (hear, hear.) The chief source of revenue intended was the Customs duties. The lands of Upper Canada were much more likely to attract emigration than the lands of Lower Canada. The revenue to be derived from the sale of lands in Upper Canada was much more likely to exceed the corresponding revenue from Lower Canada. Man for man, the population of Upper Canada contributed more to the Customs Revenue than the population of Lower Canada. Upper Canada with an increasing population in a short time would contribute more to the revenue than Lower Canada. Looking to the future there was every reason to believe

Mr. Harrison.

that while Upper Canada entered the Union with less population and more debt than Lower Canada, in the course of time the positions of the two Provinces would be so far reversed as to make a union on equal terms politically and financially desirable by the people of both Provinces. This, Sir, was the view at all events entertained by the Imperial Government, and this view has been fully sustained by our experience of that Union. Soon the population of Upper Canada became equal to that of Lower Canada; soon our contributions to the revenue equalled those of Lower Canada. By means of the new Public Works in respect of which our debt was incurred, our tax-paying ability was greatly increased, and the whole country shared largely in our prosperity, (cheers.) I say this Sir in no boastful spirit; I mention it simply as a fact, and give it as a reason sustaining alike the Imperial policy and the position for which we now contend before this House. In the course of time we obtained a large preponderance of wealth and population. In 1861 while the population of Lower Canada was 1,000,000, our population was 1,300,000. In my references to figures I intend to drop as much as possible decimals or fractions. It was not long till we discovered that we were in this way paying nearly 5-9ths of the revenue. In 1857, we believe, including our sales from Crown Lands, that we were paying 2-3rds of the revenue. There can be no doubt that before Confederation, although we were not yearly drawing more than Lower Canada out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, we were yearly putting much more into it. This was felt to be an injustice to Upper Canada, and the injustice was in a great measure admitted by Lower Canada. Representation by population was the remedy demanded by a large section of Western Canada. This was denied by a large section of Lower Canada. The result was threats of a dissolution of the Union and the impossibility of any Government holding power that would alike command the support of Upper and Lower Canada. It was felt that dissolution would be a retrograde movement, and in our extremity we seized the idea of Confederation, an idea which has been realized with most happy results. Well, sir, during the existence of the Union additional public works were constructed in both sections of the united Province. These public works were paid for out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. When a grant was made for public works in one section of the Province a corresponding grant was made to the other section. By these means assets became legalised, and financial equality of expenditure was as nearly as possible pre-

served. There were those who maintained that while Upper Canada contributed the greater part of the public revenue she procured the lesser part for expenditure on public works. I shall not stop to enquire whether this assertion was well founded or not. In this discussion we have nothing to do with extreme opinions in the past. I desire to deal with the present by the light of the past, and to take a retrospect only when really necessary, and in no greater extent than necessary, to understand the present. I wish to avoid giving offence. I disclaim all idea of desiring to wound the sensibilities of any section of the people that are now in this confederation, and least of all the sensibilities of our friends from Lower Canada, who in common with us made some local sacrifices in the hope, and I think I may say, the well founded hope that the general good will prevail, (cheers,) instead sir, of madly dissolving our late political union, we have like men worthy of our destiny increased and I hope perpetuated the Union. (Applause.) Instead of moving backwards we are hopefully marching onward in the great path of progressive civilization, (cheers). But sir, we have had some difficulties to encounter. By the creation of our Union an adjustment of the debts and credits, properties and assets of the several Provinces which entered confederation, became a matter of prime necessity. This adjustment in the past had been a cause of much anxiety, and in the present is still a matter of difficulty—in fact the difficulty which now I am attempting to deal with. It was necessary that the General Government should in the main assume the debt and with some local exceptions acquire the assets of the Provinces, and in order to meet the demands of the Public Creditor should have powers of taxation, powers to levy duties, and make imposts. But for the same reasons that Upper Canada had an excess of debt over Lower Canada by large expenditures on public works, it was found that United Canada had an excess of debt over the Maritime Provinces. Our debt was about \$74,000,000, and of this the confederacy assumed only \$62,500,000—leaving a surplus of \$10,500,000 for adjustment between the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. I am sorry, sir, that the adjustment was not made by the B. N. A. Had it been the difficulties now before us would not have prevented themselves. It was by a section of that Act declared that the lands and mines in the several Provinces, should the property of the Provinces in which situate. This was a localization of certain assets but not of all assets of the general Provinces. So by Section 110 of

the Act it is declared that all assets connected with such portions of the public debt of each Province as are assumed by that Province shall belong to the Province. And while all the assets mentioned in the third schedule of the Act are made the property of Canada, it is declared that the assets named in the fourth schedule shall be the property of Ontario and Quebec conjointly, and then we have in the 142nd section of the Act, the provision that the Division and adjustment of the debts, credits, liabilities, properties and assets of Upper and Lower Canada shall be referred to the arbitrament of three arbitrators, one chosen by the Government of Ontario, one by the Government of Quebec and one by the Government of Canada. In this section which is very crude, there is no express provision for a decision by a majority of the three arbitrators, nor is there in it any provision for the revocation of an arbitrator's authority, or for the appointment of a new arbitrator in the event of an arbitrator appointed refusing or becoming incapable to act. But this is the whole provision for the settlement of the debt and assets. Colonel Grey was appointed arbitrator for the Dominion in March 1868. There was not at that time any objection made to him as being a resident of Ontario. The arbitrators for the two Provinces were appointed in, I think, January 1869. These arbitrators were judges, no rule was laid down for their guidance. But whatever they were to do, they were to do as judges acting upon legal considerations, and not on political considerations or considerations of State Policy. In this particular, I unhesitatingly endorse the language, the arbitrator appointed for Quebec who said "their office is not representative or diplomatic. They are not delegates or commissioners to settle the question of division by negotiation and compromise each acting for his own Government, and bound to obtain all the advantages he can, but as arbitrators, their character and duties are judicial." The first question which presented itself for the consideration of the arbitrators, was the question whether the assets mentioned in the fourth schedule of the Act were subject to their decision in other words subject to the reference. This question was decided, I think, properly in the affirmative, and an order was made in these words "The Arbitrators having heard counsel upon the objection raised on behalf of the Government of Quebec, to their jurisdiction over the subject matter of the assets enumerated in schedule four of British North American Act 1867, and duly considered

the question are of opinion and do adjudge that the assets so enumerated make part of the property and assets the division and adjustment whereof has been referred to them under the provisions of section 142 of the said Act, and that they have by virtue of the Act authority to divide and adjust the same." This a few days since was referred to by my hon. friend the member for Peel. Upon that occasion it was maintained by the Premier of Quebec, who, I regret to say, owing to family affliction is not in his place, as I understood him, that it was not held by the Arbitrators that there was power to make any other than equal division in other words, that the words conjointly as used in the 113 section of the Act meant co-equally. In that opinion, I understood, the hon. member for Westmoreland a few days since to express his concurrence. I am unable to concur in that opinion. Looking at sections 113 and 142 of the Act, and reading them together I cannot see that the word "conjointly" necessarily means co-equally. If co-equally, why the power to divide and adjust? A power to adjust alone would have been all that was required. Power to divide and adjust implies power to make such a division as may be just whether equal or unequal. This is my view. And this, sir, was the unanimous view of the three Arbitrators. Surely members from Quebec will not in this point dispute the opinion of their own Arbitrator, Judge Day. Here are his words: "As to the word 'conjointly' and the formal expression shall be the property of Ontario and Quebec conjointly used in section 113, it does not seem to me in any degree to justify the conclusion that those assets were to be so held in perpetuity, or were to be excluded from the general expression used provided for by the Act. The use of this word 'conjointly' and the whole expression are merely the declaration of a fact, not the creation of a new right, and it can scarcely be necessary to say that if the mere fact of the property being held conjointly excludes it from the general division, then it excludes all the other assets, for they are all held conjointly, which does not, however, necessarily imply equality of interest, and if not so held, there could of course be no occasion for division. So far there was no difference of opinion among the arbitrators. But the next step was attended with greater difficulties. The question arose—by what rule shall this division and adjournment be made. The statute was silent as to a rule, but some principle of action, some rule for decision was evidently demanded. Ontario proposed any one of these rules—proportion of

Mr. Harrison.

local debts and assets—population and capitalization of assets. Quebec would have none of these and set up a so called principle of partnership—a principle which the honourable member of Hochelaga rightly treats with contempt as applied to such an enquiry. Had the Arbitrators been able to agree on any one of these rules I judge the Arbitrator for the Dominion from his language would not have dissented, and even if he had the decision of the remaining two according to the subsequent holding would have been binding. But failing an agreement between the arbitration for the Provinces, the arbitration for the Dominion adopted the principle as it is called, of "Origin of debts," and to this the Arbitrator for Ontario ultimately assented. And while Quebec refused the proposition of Ontario for proportion of local debts and assets, I find her counsel using the following language in answer to the case of Ontario: "If the argue of the debt is to be taken as a guide recourse must be had, as already stated, for Quebec to the true and real origin of the whole debt, not to that which is the work of mere fancy. This seems to be unpracticable. If, however, this method of adopting the excess of debt is adopted, Quebec will be prepared to show that it will make its position still better than the adoption of that suggested in its case" viz., partnership. The hon. member for Hochelaga says population should have been the rule. But that was steadily and firmly opposed by Quebec. Strangely infatuated with the so called principle of partnership, Quebec refused that which it said would make its position better than partnership, and refused that which the proposer of this motion says should have been accepted, viz., population. And yet it is Quebec that is now complaining at the award, and as it were, seeking to set it aside on a ground which it refused when the opportunity was given her! Why, sir, if the principles of partnership were adopted in their integrity and cross accounts taken Quebec would be, to use a common expression, nowhere. But although Quebec in words asked to have the principle of partnership applied, she only sought to charge Ontario with a debt of \$5,000,000, in other words sought to burden Ontario with \$8,250,000 of the surplus debt, leaving only \$2,250,000 for her own share. If Ontario were charged in account with the debt she should be credited with the assets representing that debt, and should be credited with excess of revenue paid by her every year up to 1867. Had this been done, Sir, Quebec would have had greater cause of complaint than she now has, (hear, hear.) On 28th May, 1870, the principle of origin of local debts

was adopted. Judge Day dissented. There was no objection up to the time alleged against Col. Grey, and no contention that unanimity of decision was requisite. I am not prepared to condemn the principle of "origin of local debts." I think there is much to be said in favour of it. When these debts were contracted for the benefit of either section of the Province of Canada, equivalents were given to the other. So that the debt represented the asset and the asset the debt. Looking at the history of financial appropriations for local works in the late Province of Canada, I must say the principle of local debts—that is—local assets to the Province in which situated and charging that Province with their cost—seems to me to have been a very natural mode of division and adjustment. When the decision was come to as to the rule of action it was, though not made public, communicated by the Arbitrators of Quebec and Ontario to their respective Governments. The next step was a telegraph dated 6th June, from Judge Day, requesting the postponement of the delivery of the decision. No particular reason was assigned for the request. But on that day I see by the correspondence that the Government of Quebec by minute in Council adopted the conclusion that it was essential to the validity of any decision to be given by the Arbitrators that their judgment should be unanimous. This minute in Council was communicated to the Arbitrators on 16th June. But at the meeting of the arbitrators held in Montreal on 6th July, following Ontario demanded the publication of the decision. This was resisted by Quebec on the ground that unanimity was necessary, and that at all events that question should be argued and determined before the decision was pronounced as to the rule of action. To this contention the arbitrators submitted. An argument was had on the unanimity, and unanimity was held not to be necessary. Judge Day then voluntarily retired from the court and a protest was filed against Col. Grey's qualification. On 9th July, Judge Day tendered his resignation to the Government of Quebec, which resignation was afterwards accepted, his authority as an arbitrator attempted to be revoked and application made to the local courts for prohibition of this process to restrain the proceedings of the remaining arbitrators. So annoyed were the arbitrators at these extra, judicial and illegal proceedings, that they held the remaining meetings in Toronto, beyond the reach of the nugatory but annoying proceedings of the Quebec Court, of the Courts of Quebec to restrain the Arbitrators the Courts of Quebec would have power to command them to proceed.

What would be the result? The Arbitrators could not remain in either Province. The very statement of the proposition shows the absurdity of such a usurpation of jurisdiction. On 4th August the two Arbitrators met in Toronto decided to pay no submission to the proceedings of the Quebec Courts, and adjourned till 17th August so as to notify Judge Day to be present at their deliberations if he saw fit. Judge Day attended no meetings in Toronto. An award was made giving about five-ninths of the assets at their full value to Ontario and four-ninths to Quebec. It also made provision for the payment of the surplus debt. This award so made is now attacked for illegality and injustice. It does not appear to me that any of the objections to the validity of the award are entitled to prevail. Take first the alleged disqualification of Col. Grey. I do not think there is anything in the objection, and if there were the objection has been waived. I admit that the British North America Act declares that the Arbitrator chosen by the Government of Canada shall not be a resident either in Ontario or Quebec. Was Colonel Grey, when appointed in March 1868, a resident of Ontario? It is not pretended that he was, but it is said that by afterwards remaining here, he became a resident; subsequent residence does not forfeit the office. There was qualification at the time of the appointment. But supposing subsequent residence would forfeit the office; did Colonel Grey ever become a resident within the meaning of the enactment? Residence in the section means permanent residence—a person resident in one of the Provinces without an *animus revertendi* to his own Province. It is not pretended that Colonel Grey did at any time give up the intention of returning to New Brunswick, the Province from which he came. His residence here was temporary and only for the purpose of discharging his public duties at the seat of Government of the Dominion. But, sir, if there were any thing in the objection, it should have been taken before July 1870. It was not taken in the order in Council of Quebec of 6th June 1870.

Mr. JOLY begged to be permitted to remark that the objection was taken by the order in Council of 6th June, before the retirement of Judge Day, and referred to the hon. member for Megantic to support this statement.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE corroborated the statement.

Mr. HARRISON—I have in the book before me what purports to be a copy of that order in Council, and in it there is no reference to the residence of Colonel Grey.

Mr. JOLY said the copy was not correct.

Mr. Harrison.

The only correct copy was the one in the blue book published at Quebec.

Mr. HARRISON—I have not seen the book to which the hon. gentleman refers. But assuming that the printed copy which I hold in my hands, is not correct in the particular mentioned, the position of Quebec is not at all improved. So long as there was a chance of Colonel Grey deciding favorably to Quebec, there was no objection to him. But when it was found by his decision of May, that he was likely to give an independent judgment, and that judgment adverse to the supposed interests of Quebec, objection was for the first time raised. Had he decided for Quebec I apprehend there would have been no objection on the part of Quebec. Now, a party to litigation cannot take the chance without objection of a favorable decision from an arbitrator and afterwards repudiate his authority when the decision is found to be adverse, (hear, hear). This seems to me to have been the conduct of Quebec. And if so supposing the objection to be at all well taken, it was not taken in sufficient time to be now available, as if it were on an application to set aside the award. Nor do I think that the objection as to want of unanimity is well founded. It is true that the section of the British North America Act does not provide for a decision of the majority. And if this were the case of a private award, I should hold the objection a fatal one. But in the case of public awards the rule is different. In the case of a private award where a reference fails the parties are remitted to the ordinary Courts of the country, which have jurisdiction to settle their disputes. So that there can be no failure of justice. But in the case of a public award—and that this is a public award has never been denied, the ordinary Courts have no jurisdiction. The only Court having jurisdiction is the Court specially constituted for the settlement of the matters in dispute. It was intended by the Act that there should be a decision. If so it was never intended that any one of the three Arbitrators by refusing to join in the decision could prevent a decision. The question is one simply of intention. And in such a case in order to prevent any one Arbitrator holding the absolute power to prevent a decision, it has been again and again held that without express words of authority the majority may make an award. Books of practice are full of decisions on this ground. If I am right in this view, it disposes of the next objection taken to the award, that is to say, that it was made in the absence of the Arbitrator for Quebec. I admit that if any trick had been practiced upon him, that if no opportunity

had been given him to be present. at deliberations of the Arbitrators, that if no opportunity had been given him to concur in the decision which was pronounced, the objection would be a good one. But his absence was voluntary, he had every opportunity to be present at the deliberations of the Arbitrators and refused. His absence was not the fault of Ontario but of Quebec. He resigned because he could not agree with his co-judges on the questions submitted for decision. The law makes no provision for such a resignation or for the revocation of authority under such circumstances. And I never before heard of a Judge resigning his position on the bench because in a matter brought up for decision he was in the minority. His absence was therefore not only voluntary but wrongful, and those who are responsible for the wrong are now seeking to get up their own wrong as a ground for relief from the award. Such a position is surely untenable, as well in morals as in law (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. DORION.—Suppose Colonel Gray had also refused to act, could the Arbitrator for Ontario have given a decision?

Mr. HARRISON.—No! Because then it would have been the decision of a minority. I do not argue for the validity of a minority but of a majority decision. This disposed of all the objections taken to the award, with the exception of one, and that is the division of the assets mentioned in the Fourth Schedule. I have already adverted to this point. I have shown that "conjunctly" does not necessarily mean coequally, and I have shown the authority of Judge Day himself in support of this argument. In what I have said about the Arbitrator for Quebec I mean no disrespect to that learned gentleman. On the contrary, I have the pleasure of his acquaintance, and can sincerely join with those who deservedly hold his legal attainments in high respect, what he did, he did, I am sure, from proper motives, and as he thought for the best in the interest of his Province. I should be sorry to assail his motives or the motives of any of the gentlemen who acted as Arbitrators. But when he agrees with me on a point of law, when that was the only point on which the Arbitrators were unanimous, I have a right to assume against Quebec that the point was well decided. Well, so, assuming it, there is involved in the assumption the discretionary powers to make an unequal division—less to one, more to the other, as influenced by considerations of Justice. This brings me to the remaining ground on which apart from the validity of the award, its

justice is attacked. I cannot help thinking that those who hold strong views against the validity of the award weaken their position by any general argument of its alleged injustice in a political point of view, or on mere political considerations. (Hear, hear.) But even here, Sir, we are prepared to join issue with those who attack the award.

It being 6 o'clock, the House arose

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. HARRISON resumed the debate—Before the adjournment Sir, I gave my reasons for not being able to agree to the proposition that the award is void for illegalities. Gentlemen from Quebec differ from me, but I have, I think, at all events shown to the House that the validity of the award is not so clearly to be decided against us as assumed by those gentlemen. Whether legal or not is a question of law? Who is to decide that question? Not the Government, for it is not a court of law; not this House for it is not a court of law. All that the House can say is that the validity of the award, considering the conflict of opinion among the legal gentlemen in the House and out of the House, is doubtful. But so long as it is doubtful I contend the House should not deal with it. Let the legal question be determined by a competent tribunal. Until the decision of some tribunal having authority to deal with such matters I contend we have nothing to do with it as just or unjust under political considerations. But while taking this position I am not to be understood as conceding that it is unjust. It is alleged that it is unjust because it concedes to Ontario five-ninths of the assets. But these assets are local assets. If it be true that Upper Canada contributed five-ninths of the revenue I apprehend her receiving five-ninths of the assets cannot be said to be unjust. Besides this has the merit of being as nearly as possible a decision according to population. And the fact that it is so, goes far to prove that the rule adopted by the Arbitrators is more than a mere arbitrary one, that it is a rule in its operation so just that the result is nearly the same as that of which Quebec is now so much in favour—I mean population. It is alleged that some of the assets assigned to Lower Canada are worthless. That, I think, may be said of some of the assets assigned to Upper Canada. But if during the Union, money was squandered in one section of the Province more than in the other, that is of itself no reason for increasing the burdens on the section which spent its money judiciously and has the more valuable assets to show for the expenditure. The great outcry, however,

against the award arises from the fact that the Arbitrators did not see their way to charge Upper Canada with the debt of \$5,000,000. I confess, to me, that while this is the point on which those who attack the award most dwell, it is the least defensible of all the points taken. The assets in respect of which that debt was mainly incurred are now the property of the Dominion, and Quebec and Ontario in their dealings with the remaining Provinces to the Federal compact have conjointly received credit for them. Besides, Lower Canada during the Union had the use of them free of cost. And this is sought to be accomplished under the specious phrase partnership—a partnership all on one side—a partnership without the taking of accounts—a partnership which takes from one of the partners works of the value of nearly \$5,000,000 and seeks to charge him the debt for cost of construction, while refusing to allow him anything for his property or surplus contributions to the common fund. The position is a monstrous one. I cannot think that those who advocate it have ever considered it in all its bearings. But I am unable to see what authority the Arbitrators had to go behind the Act of Union. Their power was to divide and adjust the debts and assets in which the Provinces were conjointly interested, that is as I understand it, debts and assets which arose after the Union, and during its continuance. I may be mistaken in this opinion, I am not bigoted to my opinion, but the more I reflect upon it the more strengthened I become in the conviction that it is right. I, however, for reasons already given, do not think it necessary to prosecute this enquiry any further. Underlying it are the legal questions. They must be determined by the Privy Council. If decided in favour of Quebec, there must be a new Arbitration. If decided against Quebec, and Quebec be notwithstanding able to show injustice or oppression, I can vouch for it that the public men of Ontario will not be found unreasonable or exacting, (applause). Our public men are I think disposed not only to act justly but liberally to our Lower Canada neighbours, whose welfare is our welfare and whose prosperity is our prosperity, (cheers). We are now in Confederation for weal or for woe. The issue must under Providence to a great extent depend on our own conduct towards each other. Sectional strife must, above all things, be avoided. (Hear, hear.) The thought of disruption is not for a moment to be entertained. (Cheers.) The man who needlessly provokes sectional strife wickedly weakens the ties of Confederation, and

Mr. Harrison

knowingly strengthens the hands of our enemies. I look upon the resolution moved by the member for Hochelaga as inexpedient and unnecessary. I hold it inexpedient because it is inopportune; because its pressure while the legal questions are undecided needlessly raises dissension; because not so much framed in the interests of our common country as for the purpose of gaining some party advantage over the Government of Quebec. I cannot forget in what manner the mover taunted the Minister of Militia with the vengeance of Quebec, for in his place as a member of this House and Leader of the Government doing what he considered to be his duty in the interest of the whole Dominion. I say, Sir, that on questions of this serious character, the claims of our country must be placed higher than the mere claims of party, (cheers.) I think the resolution unnecessary, for without the aid of the Imperial Parliament, we have according to the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, a right to do what we like with our own. Entertaining this opinion of the motion of the member for Hochelaga, I shall vote against it and against any similar resolution with similar party objects that may come from a member for Ontario. The occasion is too serious a one for mere party manœuvres. The amendment moved by the member for Chateauguay has all the vice of the motion of the member for Hochelaga, with this addition, that its carriage would be the defeat of the Government that has already done so much in building up our Confederation [cheers]. Let us now that we are about to welcome British Columbia into the Union, tighten the bonds of union. Other Provinces, such as Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, have yet to apply for admission. We must not by needless discussion frighten them from doing so—divided we fall—united we stand—divided we shall relapse into our former state of colonial littleness; united we shall present to the world the spectacle of a great and growing confederacy, in process of time second to none on this continent (loud cheers).

Mr. MILLS agreed with some of the remarks of his hon. friend from Toronto, and from some he differed. He did not believe that if the House had no jurisdiction in the matter, as asserted by the hon. member, then he had no right to discuss it on its merits. However, there was this justification for him, that if the Ontario members refused to discuss it on its merits, the Quebec representatives might suppose that there were no just grounds on which to rest the claims of Ontario. It seemed to him there was something more to be discussed in this case than merely its

merits. At the London Conference it was decided that the Dominion should assume sixty-two millions of the debt of Canada, and that the remaining ten and a half millions should be divided between the two Provinces. Now, he contended that unless the parties who were now liable for this debt should come to this House and ask that this debt should be assumed by the Parliament of Canada. It was therefore presumptuous on the part of this Government and this House to talk of assuming this debt when neither of the parties interested in it had asked them to take. He disapproved of the motion of the hon. member for Chateaugay, for it asked Ontario to contribute the same proportion she did pay before Confederation, and which was thought to be unjust in itself, and which gave rise to the demand for constitutional changes. If this motion, asking for the assumption of the surplus debt were carried, could they assume the debt imposed by the constitution on Ontario, and particularly without the consent of its representatives? Till the people or Government of Ontario asked that the debt should be assumed by the Dominion, this Parliament had no right or power to assume it. This House at present was not the tribunal to settle this question. He did not feel disposed to discuss this question on its merits. He quite agreed with the views taken of this question by the hon. member for Toronto. He believed that much more could be said in defence of the validity of the award. The question for this House to decide was whether it had jurisdiction to set aside that award. All other questions should be lost sight of at least until this one was settled. Supposing it were possible for this Parliament or Dominion to assume the surplus debt of the two Provinces, without their consent or solicitation, the Lower Provinces would have to be compensated. The debt would swell from ten and a half to twelve and a half millions, of which Ontario would have to pay seven millions. Now, it was to get rid of what was admitted to be unjust that a portion of the debt was taken from the Dominion Government and given to the Local Governments. The House had, therefore, no right to ask for changes. The Confederation Act was a compact which the House had no right to violate, a compact which had received the assent of the Imperial Government, and which was therefore binding.—He did not agree with the member for West Toronto as to the way the motion of the member for Hochelaga should be treated. We had no right to attempt to settle the question here. How came it that the party satisfied with the decision

should be forced to appeal from it? The Government, having appointed arbitrators, should act on their award, and leave it to the dissatisfied party to make the appeal. The Government had no discretion in the matter, but having decided not to act upon it, they virtually declared it invalid. The member for West Toronto was bound to contend the Government should not act on this award till set aside by a competent authority (hear, hear).

Mr. DUFRESNE would not discuss the question as to its legality or illegality, for he maintained that the validity of an award was only to be decided by the power which appointed the arbitration. He did not think that the discussion of validity in this House was calculated to benefit either Ontario or Quebec. He thought the position taken by some hon. members that this question should be decided by a majority of this House was one fraught with danger. The framers of the Union Act had very wisely left the disposal of the assets of the late Province to a power outside of this House, and it was well that a question so calculated to create sectional jealousies should have been left for decision to an arbitration. The Government of Ottawa properly said, they would not take cognisance of the award till a higher tribunal acted upon it. That was the only safe and logical position. The only motion that should receive his support would be that of the hon. Minister of Militia. The only wise course was to accept it and remain quiet (hear, hear and laughter).

Mr. JOLY said, that the members representing Quebec were unanimous on this question. He was afraid that the arguments advanced by the Premier of Quebec might not have had due effect from the fact of his having to speak in a language not his own. The representatives of Quebec were determined to adopt every constitutional means in their power to oppose the award. The general argument of those speaking against the amendment of the hon. member for Chateaugay seemed to be that the Dominion Parliament was not the proper body to deal with the question, but he was convinced that however the matter was decided by the Privy Council, whether Quebec was successful or not, as in the event of Quebec being successful there would have to be a new Arbitration, for the forming of which there was no provision in the present state of the law, the matter would sooner or later have to be dealt with by that House, and he thought further that now, when the House seemed to desire to dispose of the question in such a way as would allay all bitterness, and when Ontario seemed disposed to deal justly and generously, now was the best

time to deal with the matter; and, according to his view the only way in which the matter could be dealt with, satisfactorily, was for the Dominion to assume the whole of the debt,—and he thought if such a proposal had emanated from some hon. member on the Government side of the House it would have met with a much better reception than now, that it had originated with the honourable member for Chateaugay. If the Privy Council should decide Quebec was wrong, and that the award was good in what position would the Quebec members stand? Could they again come before the House and protest against an alleged injustice? They would not in such event be in as good a legal position as at present. While the present doubt existed, Quebec members should anxiously seek for a decision of the question by this House. The only argument against the motion of the member for Chateaugay, on the part of Quebec members, was that it was one of non-confidence. If any member was of opinion that the Government had not acted properly or wisely in this matter, he should express freely his regret that such an easy mode of settling this difficulty as the member for Hochelaga proposed was not recommended by the Government. He thought the member for West Toronto was very severe in saying that if a comparison between the rival claims of Quebec and Ontario were made on the basis of their respective contributions to the revenue, since the former Union, Quebec would be nowhere. Certainly she had not paid in as much as Ontario during the latter half of the union period, but had been the greater contributor during the first portion of the time. Besides, the admissions of eminent Upper Canadians were on record, to show the high appreciation of the benefits of union with Quebec, formed by the people of the West in 1840 and 1841. Certainly their admissions would not justify the conclusion that Quebec occupied a comparatively unimportant place in the union, or was a partner of little value. He thought in discussing this question, that no harm would be done—no obstacle thrown in the way of an early and a proper solution of the difficulty, by rendering justice to the Eastern Province. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. IRVINE said it appeared as if the gentlemen who had spoken were generally of opinion that the House was not the proper tribunal to deal with the question, and they had all discussed it very fully, and the hon. member for Toronto West although one of the most decided in that opinion, had been the one who had gone most deeply into the question. As he also was of opinion that the

question would go before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that that therefore would be the appropriate place to advance the legal views of the case, he should not follow the example set him, and discuss the legality of the matter, but he could not refrain from explaining his views of the difficult position in which he conceived the members for Quebec to be placed. If the award bore any semblance of legality, or was based on any principle, so that they would have been able to say to their people that the judgment appeared to be according to law, they would have endeavored to submit, but they were not able to say so, they could not say that judgment had been given by a proper authority, or that they had their property taken from them on any recognisable principle. With regard to the points raised as to the residence in Ontario of the Dominion Arbitrator, and the necessity for an unanimous decision, he did not intend more than to mention those questions, but he thought that the main difficulty consisted in this, that the law required that the tribunal should be constituted of three, while at the time of the award, the award was not only given by two, but by those two at a time when the third had ceased to be one of their number, and it was perfectly manifest that whereas the Court was required to be composed of three it was in reality composed of two. The circumstance of the third having been notified of the continuance of the proceedings had no bearing on the subject, for any individual might just as well have been so notified as Judge Day for any connection he then had with the matter. It was pretended that because he had accepted the post, and commenced the duties, he was therefore bound to carry the matter out to the end, but he thought such a proposition could not be supported, as it would be absurd to suppose that when a man once commenced an undertaking, no possible circumstance could relieve him from carrying it out. It was further contended that if it were admitted that two Arbitrators could not make an award, therefore no award would ever be arrived at, but he denied that, for though Judge Day might cease to be an Arbitrator there was nothing to prevent the Province of Quebec from naming another in his stead. But had that Province ever been asked to name another person? No. On the contrary the remaining Arbitrators continued their sittings on the very day that Judge Day resigned, and on the following day, on being served with a prohibition from the Superior Court of Montreal, they at once removed to Toronto, and immediately

Mr. Joly.

with the most extraordinary haste the whole matter was wound up, and the award given by the two remaining Arbitrators. For this reason, independent of others, they could not face their people, and advise them to submit to the decision. If it could have been urged that though, perhaps not legal, the award was just, and that their best plan was to accept it, and so avoid all further difficulties, they might have consented to do so, but such was not the case, for on looking into the matter they found Ontario with an immense preponderance of assets, and that while Ontario commenced the Union in debt and came out rich, the reverse was the case with Quebec. He did consider that they were entitled to be judged on some principle, and not that they should be judged on one principle one day, and then when that principle acted to their advantage that the opposite one should be taken. They had been told that if the award had been on a partnership basis as they had proposed they would have been in a worse position than at present, but even then they would have had some satisfaction in knowing that they had been judged on the principle for which they contended. Under these circumstances, they could not advise their people to submit to the award, but were compelled to endeavour by all the constitutional means in their power to escape from that award. The present question, however, was how the House should deal with the matter. The hon. member for Chateauguay, had asked them to lay aside the whole proceedings of the late Province of Canada, and ask the Imperial authorities to give to the Parliament of Canada, authority to deal with the matter, but looking at the question, not in a Quebec, but a Dominion point of view, he thought such would be most undesirable, and he did not see why they should seek to throw such an apple of discord into their midst—and if such were done, and they were called upon to make an award, he was sure they would fail far more signally than the arbitrators had done. He did not think it could have been expected that the Government should take the matter up in a different way from that in which they had done. It had been contended that they were bound to notice the award, and act upon it, but in his opinion, they had acted far more wisely, as the judgment was of such a nature that it was impossible for them to act upon it, and all they could do was to leave the matter to be decided by the proper tribunal. This would be the result of the motion of the hon. Minister of Militia. But there was one difficulty in bringing the matter before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, namely,

that the question would have to be argued simply in its legal aspect, without regard to the merits of the case. If that Committee should decide in favour of Quebec, the matter would remain in very much its present position, while, if the decision should be in favour of Ontario, which he did not believe possible, the difficulty would still not be removed. He thought, therefore, that if the matter could be settled without reference to the Privy Council, such should be done. The hon. member for Lotbiniere had objected to any member refusing to vote for a motion, because, while he agreed with the principle, it involved a want of confidence, but he thought it perfectly proper, while agreeing with an abstract proposition, not to vote for it, when couched in such a way as to be a direct attack on a Government he desired to support, and while he agreed with the motion of the member for Chateauguay, he would not vote for it in its present shape. If some arrangement could be made by which the Dominion should assume the debt, in a satisfactory way to both Ontario and Quebec, the whole difficulty would be overcome, and he was sure the Dominion would suffer no less. He understood that the Premier of Quebec, in the event of the amendment of the Hon. member for Chateauguay being lost, had intended to prepare a further amendment, having a similar object, but not couched in such disagreeable terms, but he very much regretted to say that his hon. friend had been compelled to leave the city on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. GEOFFRION said there were three parties interested in this matter, the two Provinces and the Dominion Government. It was the duty of the latter to be in a position to express an opinion on the award. It was, therefore, quite proper for the hon. member for Bellechasse to introduce a motion asking the House to declare that the award was illegal. It would then be for the Government to take action as the majority of the House should decide. He did not propose to speak of the justice of the award, but he could not agree with the view taken by the hon. member for Toronto that if the debt had been divided in proportion to the amount paid by each Province, Ontario would get two-thirds of the assets. If such a basis should be adopted, Quebec, being the older Province and having been contributing to the debt for a longer period than Ontario, would receive a larger proportion of the assets. The motion of the member for Chateauguay proposed the Dominion's assumption of the surplus debt, and the compensation of the Lower Provinces, several members approved of this principle, but con-

demned its form because expressing regret or want of confidence in the Government. The Government, however, first opposed the motion from the Opposition side of the House. The motion of the member for Chateauguay was but the complement of that of the member for Hochelaga. Ministers did not act, however, as if they really believed the former a motion of want of confidence. The question was—was there a difficulty between Quebec and Ontario respecting the decision of the Arbitrators? He believed so, and that the member for Chateauguay proposed the proper remedy. The principle of the motion was practically approved by the Quebec Ministry, and other members on the Ottawa Government side of the House. Since the Solicitor General for Quebec said he would support it presented in another form, it was amazing to see how the motions of hon. members of the Opposition from Quebec were regarded by the hon. members from the same Province on the opposite side of the House. The motives of hon. members on his (Opposition) side of the House were impugned, and the hon. members themselves were charged with a desire to injure their Province. It seemed to him that this cry was too old now to have any effect. It seemed to him that the only excuse for delaying the settlement of this question till after an appeal should be made to the Privy Council, was to have it unsettled till after the elections. If he were as ready to impugn the motives of hon. members opposite as they (the Government) were to charge hon. members of the Opposition with bad motives, he would say that this was their object. It would, at any rate, be a more plausible accusation to make against them. He would, however, say nothing more on the subject. He would record his vote for the motion of the hon. member for Chateauguay, believing that it proposed the best mode of settling the difficulty. (Cheers.)

Mr. SCATCHERD said he had heard nothing to change his opinion that the award was fair and just, or that Ontario should appeal to the Privy Council. What had both parties to do but submit to the award of Arbitrators to whose appointment all parties consented. What surprised him was that not one of the Ontario Ministers or Dominion Ministers had hitherto spoken on this subject. He thought the Ottawa Government responsible for all the present difficulty. If they had stopped the arbitration proceedings on Judge Day's retirement, or acted upon the award when made, the present trouble would not have resulted. The motion of the member for Hochelaga could not have

been designed for any other purpose than political effect in Quebec. If the Dominion assumed the surplus debt, as before, Ontario would be unjustly dealt with, as she would have to pay for three-fourths of this liability. He proceeded to reply to some of the remarks and arguments of Quebec members on this subject, and expressed himself incredulous as to any attempt of Quebec to secede in consequence of the adverse award. He did not think Ontario should take any action touching this award in the shape of an appeal from it. He would vote in a manner to express his disapproval of the conduct of the Government in this important matter (hear, hear.)

Hon. JOS. HOWE said that he would regret extremely that the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec should disunite on this subject. He had been led to believe that a case once before a legal tribunal could not be dealt with by this House. How could Government dare to control the decision of a Judge? The representatives of the Maritime Provinces viewed this question in a different light, perhaps, from that of the interested parties. They considered that a great tribunal had been established for the settlement of this question, and it would be a grave breach of duty for the Government to step in and interfere with the decision of the arbitrators. He, as a member of the Administration would oppose any such action on the part of the Cabinet. He contended that legal tribunals should deal with this question and all such sources should be exhausted before the House undertook to grapple with it. It was clear, therefore, that it was premature to discuss the question now in this House. All the interests of this great Dominion depended on a fair and impartial decision of this difficulty, by a competent legal tribunal, and he hoped it would be settled in that way, rather than by a majority in this House. The member for Vercheres referred to what had taken place in the case of Nova Scotia. Here was a political question, not a legal one, and the result had proved the sagacious character of its settlement. All he could say was that when the present question came before the House properly, the members from the Maritime Provinces would do their best to deal with it considerably, generously and fairly, remembering their candid and liberal treatment by the majority of this House from Quebec and Ontario. Meantime it was only a waste of time to continue the discussion of this question.

Mr. MAGILL regretted that this question was again brought before the House.

Mr. Geoffrion.

He had hoped that not only the wisdom of our own country, but that of Great Britain had decided how this debt was to be divided. He was satisfied that it had been adjusted on fair and equitable principles and that if it had been as favourable to Quebec as to Ontario, the people of the Upper Province would not murmur at it, but accept the award as final. The Provinces entered the Confederation as equals and, therefore, that basis should be accepted. The accounts should be settled between them as between partners from the date of the Union. If the Province of Quebec had expended her funds extravagantly while the other Province had by prudence and economy increased in wealth, it was manifestly unfair to make an equal division of the assets when an adjustment was made. The one which had been thrifless had no right to a share of the savings of the other.

Mr. LANGLOIS argued that the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga would be most dangerous in its results if carried. It proposed that the Imperial Parliament should give to the Canadian the power to settle this question. From the speeches and arguments he had heard during the debate, it was evident that the Quebec members would take one side, and the Ottawa members the other. How then was the difficulty to be overcome in this House? Quebec could only fall back on the members of the Maritime Provinces who, no doubt would also be divided, and they would be as far off a settlement as ever. The member for Hochelaga had himself admitted that the question was a purely legal one, then why take it from a legal tribunal like the Privy Council to submit it to this Legislature? The award was undoubtedly invalid because it was made by two members of a court which was specifically composed of three. He contended there was no force in the argument that Upper Canada should be credited with a large amount of assets as an offset to her five millions of debt; because that the public works for which this debt was incurred, turned to the general advantage. Quebec had also spent a great deal in public works, and had as good a right to claim consideration on this head. Yet she had no doubt on entering the Union, and was ready to bear a share of that of Ontario. He replied to other arguments on the side of Ontario, and declared his determination to oppose the motion of the member for Hochelaga.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said Quebec had not come before the House as a Province, its representatives here differing widely on the Arbitration question. The Ministers of Quebec did not propose

an appeal on any other action on their part, and the Ottawa Ministers had shown themselves equally inactive. An appeal to the Privy Council had been talked of. If it approved of the award there would be still more reason for coming here than at present, at least before all the Provinces were consulted on the subject of the financial arrangements which formed the basis of the Union. He did not think they ought to take up this question in Parliament at this time; and unless the other Provinces, all interested in the financial basis of the union, were consulted, he did not see why this matter should be taken up at all. For the present he would probably vote against all the motions on this subject.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER thought it strange that no one had apologized for the absence of the hon. member for Chateauguay, who had proposed a motion of want of confidence. It was more grievous in its injustice towards Quebec than the resolution of the hon. member for Hochelaga, for it forced a judgment against Quebec when that Province was not in a position to say it was labouring under a grievance. The Dominion Government was trustee of the assets to be divided between the two Provinces, yet this motion called on them (the Government) to hand over the assets before the award was sustained.

Mr. BARTHE said it was undeniable that the people of Quebec were indignant at the manner in which their interests had been sacrificed by the Arbitrators. This was no question of money, but one of politics, and was therefore one to be discussed and settled by this House. Quebec was undoubtedly the pivot of the Confederation, and injustice done to it was injustice done to the whole Dominion. He believed, therefore, that the argument of the Hon. Minister of Militia, that the Ontario representatives were in the majority, would not hold. Let the wrongs of Quebec be fairly shown to this House, and he had no doubt that the sense of justice would overcome all sectional partiality and a majority would be found to re-adjust this unfair award. He had for fifteen years been a supporter of the Government, but he was not prepared to sustain them in the course they were pursuing in regard to this question [hear, hear]. It was but calculated to disunite the Dominion by keeping open this irritating question.

Hon. Mr. DORION replied to the arguments of previous speakers in opposition to his motion. The Solicitor General of Quebec was another who stated, he approved of the principle of the motion of the member for Chateauguay. Well, he

[Mr. Dorion] was authorised to say that if that hon. gentleman would attach his name to the motion of the member for Chateauguay, the latter would leave it in his hands. But the Minister of Militia took a somewhat different course from other Quebec members. He (Mr. Dorion) repudiated the notion that this motion was designed as one of non-confidence. They had waited weeks for some action on the part of the Government, but though some of their members had stirred up popular feeling on this subject, none of them had taken any action in Parliament. He referred to the action of the member for Bellechasse, and other members of the Opposition to secure ministerial expression of opinion or action on this question, but all to no avail. One excuse or another of the most trivial character was objected to to prevent anything being done, and to defeat the well meant exertions of members on the left side of the House. (Hear, hear.) He then brought forward another motion. It remained for a member from Lower Canada to declare it out of order. But it had been brought in for all that, and was now before the House. The hon. members were about to declare by their vote that this was not the time to discuss the question—not till after a decision shall have been rendered by the Privy Council. The members for Ontario did not ask for it. No one declared that decision would be agreed to as final, then what good could it do to send it to that tribunal? Any member who would look at the figures would see that Ontario, though paying very little more into the treasury than Quebec, was receiving a much larger proportion of the assets. This fact alone was sufficient to show the injustice of the award. It was now for the House to say whether it was so or not. If it should be decided that the arbitration award was unjust, it was for them to readjust it. He proposed a simple remedy for the whole difficulty. Let us, the Dominion, assume the debt. This would render justice to all. This objection of non-confidence in the Government is an old device of the Ministers. When the question of the seat of Government was discussing, Lower Canada was dragged into the sacrifice of her interests by the cry of want of confidence in the Government. A decision, not in the merits of the question, was thus arrived at adverse to the feelings of nine-tenths of the country. His confidence in Parliament was unbounded—far greater than in any tribunal beyond the seas, that took little interest in our affairs. He condemned the carrying of this question to England, and various objections to his motion preferred by Que-

Hon. Mr. Dorion.

bec members, opposing the motion to assume this debt, and settle it amicably and promptly here, because of a mere silly cry, was preferring party to country—was to choose an outlet from a difficulty which must lead to serious trouble and injury to the country in the future. The award was unanimously regarded in Lower Canada as unjust, among other reasons for giving Upper Canada more than it at first claimed as its due. He was ready to take a vote on the motion, no matter whether the Government regarded it as one of want of confidence or not.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought if the House were considering a Confederation scheme, this motion would hardly have been out of place, but at the present time he regarded it as ill-timed. It opened up a field unpleasant to contemplate. It was unfortunate that each Province as it felt itself aggrieved should come here for redress. It argued badly for the future harmony of the Confederation. He did not approve of the action of the Government in this case. If they considered the award valid they should at once have acted on it, but they seemed to have suspended the action indefinitely. The award had been made and they should have at once apportioned the debt according to that decision. Looking at the case as a lawyer, he did not think that the arbitrators had proceeded on a right principle, but that was a matter to be decided by a legal tribunal. If the principle of partnership was to be the test of the justice of the award, he contended that Quebec had nothing to complain of. He was sorry that the people of the Lower Province, many of them the very people who had helped to bring about the present condition of affairs, should now complain of the result and create discontent in Quebec instead of endeavoring to allay the prevailing dissatisfaction.

The House divided on the motion of Hon. Mr. Holton which was lost, yeas 16, nays 96.

Yeas—Messrs. Barthe, Bechard, Bourassa, Cheval, Cimon, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Joly, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer and Tremblay—16.

Nays—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Brouseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Caley, Colby, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Grant, Grover, Harrison, Hincks, Sir Francis, Holmes, Howe, Irvine,

Jackson, Keeler, Kempt, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), MacFarlane, Magill, Masson, (Soulanges), Masson, (Terrebonne), McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McGreevy, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Victoria, C.) Oliver, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Wellington, D. C.), Savary, Scatcherd, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Snider, Street, Sylvain, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Wells, White, Whitehead, Wilson, Wright, (County of Ottawa) and Wright (York, Ontario, D. O.)—96.

Mr. MILLS moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words after "that," be struck out, and the following substituted. "The division of the excess of debt of the former Province of Canada over and above the \$62,500,000 assigned to the Dominion by the British North American Act, having been referred to arbitrators appointed under authority of the said Act, and a majority of the Arbitrators so appointed having made an award, this House is of opinion that the Government, in the adjustment of accounts between each Province and the Dominion, should act upon the basis of the award".

A vote was taken without discussion, and the motion was lost: Yeas, 25; nays, 84.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Bowell, Brown, Cameron (Huron), Cartwright, Dobbie, Drew, Kempt, Little, MacFarlane, Magill, McDougall (Lanark), Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Ross (Wellington, D. C.), Scatcherd, Snider, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wells, White and Whitehead, (York, Ontario, D. O.)—25.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Boursseau, Cameron, (Inverness), Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cayley, Cheval, Cimon, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Delorme, Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Grant, Grover, Harrison, Hincks, (Sir Francis), Holmes, Howe, Irvine, Jackson, Joly, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Luxemburg), Masson, (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall, (Trois Rivières), McGreevy, Moffatt, Morris, Paquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Pozer, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross, (Champlain), Savary, Scriver, Simard, Simpson,

Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Wilson, and Wright, (County of Ottawa.)—84.

Hon. Mr. IRVINE said he had intended moving an amendment to that of the Minister of Militia, in order to the Dominion's assumption of the surplus debt and assets, and the consequent proportionable compensation of the Maritime Provinces; but after the two distinct expressions of the opinion in the House just taken, he did not think this the proper or opportune moment to submit his amendment (hear, hear.)

Mr. JOLY moved in amendment that the following words be added to the motion: "That this House regrets that the Government of Canada did not take any action in order to suspend the proceedings of the two remaining Arbitrators before the award was made, when requested so to do by the Government of Quebec." In a speech of some length he censured the Government for not having interfered in time to prevent the occurrence of this difficulty, after having been twice appealed to in the most solemn manner by the Quebec Government, to stay the proceedings of the Arbitrators after the withdrawal of the representative of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that after the decided expression of the House in the two divisions which had just been taken, the hon. member for Lotbinière could hardly expect to carry his motion, and it would be as well not to press it.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that if it was a covert attempt to commit the House to the principle that the award of an Arbitration was not valid if it was not a unanimous decision.

The House divided on the motion which was lost. Yeas, 15; nays, 95.

YEAS.—Messrs. Barthe, Bechard, Boursseau, Cheval, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Joly, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer and Tremblay.—15.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Boursseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Cayley, Cimon, Colby, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Grover, Harrison, Hincks, (Sir Francis), Holmes, Howe, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kempt, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), MacFarlane, Magill, Masson, (Terrebonne), McDougall,

(Lanark), McDougall, (Trois Rivières), McGreevy, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Victoria), Oliver, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross, (Champlain), Ross, (Wellington, D. C.), Savary, Scatcherd, Sriver, Simard, Simpson, Snider, Street, Sylvain, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Wells, White, Whitehead, Wilson, Wright (County of Ottawa), and Wright (York, Ontario, D. O.).—95.

Hon. Mr. DORION announced that he would vote against the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia, because it committed the Quebec members to the position of the decision of a tribunal of which the House knew nothing and which was not even mentioned in the resolutions.

A division was taken on the amendment of Sir Geo. E. Cartier, which was carried. Yeas, 68; nays, 40.

Yeas—Messrs. Archambeault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Brousseau, Cameron, [Inverness], Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cayley, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Grover, Harrison, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holmes Howe, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lawson, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald, [Lunenburg], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McDougall [Three Rivers], McGreevy, Moffatt, Morris, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross, [Champlain], Savary, Sriver, Simard, Simpson, Snyder, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Wilson and Wright [County of Ottawa].—68.

Nays—Messrs. Anglin, Ault, Barthe, Béchard, Bourassa, Bowell, Brown, Cameron [Huron], Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Joly, Kempt, Lapum, MacFarlane, Magill, McDougall [Lanark], Metcalfe, Mills, Morison [Victoria O.], Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Ross [Wellington, D. C.], Scatcherd, Thompson, [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Trembaly, Wells, White, Whitehead and Wright [York, Ontario, D. O.].—40.

Mr. BURPEE paired with Ross of Prince Edward.

The motion as amended was then carried, and the House adjourned at 1 a.m.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

THE CENSUS.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill (from the House of Commons) to amend the Census Act. Its main object, he stated, was to extend the provisions of the original Act to Manitoba. It was also provided in the amendments that if the Census could not be taken within the term originally contemplated, then the time should be extended to the first of September; and that the necessity of making domiciliary visits in some cases should be relaxed.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole tomorrow.

PUBLIC PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved the adoption of the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing, and stated that it simply referred to the printing of certain documents.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN called the attention of the Committee to the necessity of making some arrangement with respect to those documents which are not printed, and ought to be accessible in some shape or other.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN would bring the subject under the notice of the Committee, and explained that they adopted the plan of publishing all matters of general interest. Any member interested in the printing of a document could always direct the attention of the Committee to the matter, and it would be considered.

The motion was carried.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved the adoption of the fifth report of the same Committee, and stated that it referred to the question of binding public matter. At the time Messrs. Hunter & Rose tendered for that work, they also hoped to get the Parliamentary Printing; but their contract was not as low as that of another person who obtained the printing. The contract for binding was only an insignificant affair, and not sufficient to induce Messrs. Hunter, Rose & Co. to remain at the Capital. A Mr. Mortimer had been recommended as a suitable person to perform the work, and as he had furnished sufficient securities, the Committee felt justified in recommending that he should take the contract when it was given up by Hunter & Rose.

The motion was carried.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

THE GEOLOGICAL REPORT.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked whether it was the intention of the Government to issue a sufficient number of the Geological Report, so as to enable members to obtain more than one copy.

Hon. Mr. AIKENS replied that one copy had been distributed to every member and to Literary Societies, but there were other copies which could be purchased by the general public interested in procuring this interesting work.

LIFE ASSURANCE.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Mutual Life Assurance Association of Canada, and in doing so stated that with the exception of a single company whose head quarters were at Hamilton, that class of business was in the hands of English and American Associations. He referred to the advantages derived from Life Assurance, and to the advisability of encouraging all companies established on a secure and reliable basis. The Association in question intended doing business on the purely mutual principle.

Hon. Mr. WILSON seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN was of the opinion that such Bills were of a local character and ought to fall properly within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures. It was time that there should be some definite understanding with respect to such legislation.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN replied that the question had been raised before, but it was now the practice to introduce and pass such Bills in the Dominion Parliament. He was himself of opinion that the spirit of the Union Act clearly pointed out that all matters affecting general trade and business, except those which were specially excepted, could come before the General Legislature. Indeed, it was very important that a measure so intimately connected with the public interests should be thoroughly examined and criticised in that body.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN acknowledged that the opinions just expressed were prevailing, but, nevertheless, he believed such measures properly came under the jurisdiction of the local legislature. It was important not merely to consider the question of propriety, but the question of legality as well. If the House exceeded its jurisdiction, then the Courts might be called upon to give a decision adverse to the legality of the Act. In this connection, he referred to the British North America Act in which it was expressly stated that

"the incorporation of Companies with Provincial objects" came under the purview of the Provincial Legislatures. Those matters which were taken out of that local jurisdiction were specifically mentioned in section 91. An attempt had been made to give Parliament jurisdiction in cases like the present by declaring in the Act that the object in view was for the interests of more than one Province. He was not, however, among those who thought such legislation satisfactory. Carrying out the same principle to its logical conclusion, any mercantile incorporation could be declared of a general character. He thought such legislation by no means judicious, and would willingly prevent it if possible.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN did not think that the House should bind itself down too closely in considering measures of the kind now before it. The association intended doing business over the Dominion, and could not be considered of a purely local nature.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said that the mere passage of such Acts by the House would not necessarily make them valid, and also referred to the Union Act to show that the bill in question came properly under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders.

MANITOBA.

In pursuance with the order of the day, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill to extend certain criminal laws to the Province of Manitoba.—Hon. Mr. WILMOT in the chair.

The Committee having considered the Bill rose and reported.

The Bill was thereupon read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST asked if the Government had received any intelligence of certain difficulties having arisen in Manitoba, and of some peaceable persons having been chased out of the country.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government had no such information, and that he had heard the rumour for the first time that very moment.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 14th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3:15 p.m.

After routine.

MOTIONS.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS gave notice that he would move the House into Committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions. The first one was an amendment to the excise Act with regard to petroleum. Its object was to relieve from duty certain manufactures growing up in the country, by which, what was formerly the waste of the petroleum refineries was being utilized. It was the intention of the Government in the same Act to reduce the vapor test on petroleum. It had been found to be too high. Under the Act of last session, power was given to improve the whole of the excise laws together with the duties now in force in Manitoba, but, in consequence of a special customs tariff being in existence there, it was found inadvisable to impose the Canadian duties on Manitoba.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK introduced a Bill to incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company; also a Bill to incorporate the Forsyth Mining Company.

Mr. HARRISON moved for leave to introduce a Bill, entitled an Act to incorporate the Isolated Risk Fire Insurance Company.—Carried. He also moved for leave to introduce a Bill, entitled an Act to establish the powers of the Toronto and Nipissing Railway Company.

Carried.

Mr. HARRISON—In answer to Mr. Mills, said the object of the Bill was to enable the Company to extend the work beyond the Province of Ontario.

THE BANKING RESOLUTIONS.

On motion of Hon. Sir F. HINCKS the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the amendment of the law respecting Banks and Banking—Mr. STREET in the Chair. The mover said, that since he brought his bill before the House he found it would be necessary to proceed by resolution. The object of these resolutions was simply to affirm the general principles of the Bill he first introduced. The object of the Government was to pass one general Act applicable to all the Banks whose charters expire at the end of the present session, so as to obviate the necessity for separate charters founded on the same principle. He doubted not the Act would be found satisfactory, and that the Banks would be much better satisfied than by the system hitherto prevalent. They appeared greatly to prefer being governed by a general Act. He concluded by moving the resolutions, which have been already published.

Hon. Mr. Morris.

Mr. D. MACDONALD—There will be no necessity, therefore, for the Banks having special charters.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS replied that it would not be necessary for existing incorporated Banks to apply for special charters, but no new Bank could come under the Act without a special charter. Banks would have to apply for incorporation under the general provisions of this Act.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it would be a general Act, like the Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the hon. gentleman did not seem to propose any amendment of the Act of last session, except to allow the Banks to come under this general law. One part of the resolutions had given rise to some difficulty. What was meant by the words "cash reserves?" In Montreal there had been a good deal of discussion as to the exact meaning or requirement of the "cash reserves," on which was to be based the amount of Dominion notes or funds to be kept by the Bank.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he did not see any difficulty of the kind mentioned; nor had he heard of any, though he had had a great deal of conversation with Bankers since the Act of last session was passed. The course he proposed was, the reference of the Bill to the standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, where all those matters could be fully considered. He was sure the Bill would come from that Committee in a satisfactory shape. He then moved the adoption of the first resolution, which was carried as were all the others.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS then introduced a Bill relating to Banks and Banking.

ADMISSION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the House go into committee on Friday next to consider the resolutions respecting the admission of British Columbia. He explained that as this was a most important measure it would not be discussed till Friday next.

Hon. Mr. DORION suggested that the debate be deferred till a week from Friday next.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was not likely that the subject would be exhausted on one day. On next Tuesday, Mr. Trutch, who was at present in Washington, would be here, and as that gentleman wished to go to England as soon as possible, the debate would commence on Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. DORION said it was a very large measure, and it would be well to have the Ontario Opposition and the members of the Ontario Cabinet who were absent, in the House while it was under discussion. The debate would be protracted rather than advanced by the course which the Government proposed.

Mr. HARRISON said it was pleasant to observe that the hon. gentlemen opposite were alive to the fact that several Ontario members were absent from the House. Yesterday, when the arbitration question was brought up, they seemed to be quite oblivious of the fact (hear, hear.)

Mr. MILLS thought the House should be put in possession of a statement of the imports of British Columbia before the question should be brought before the House.

After some further discussion the motion was carried.

UNIFORMITY OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved that the House go into Committee at some future day to consider certain resolutions for the establishing of a uniform system of weights and measures for all Canada, &c.—Carried.

INSPECTION LAWS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole at a future day to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to amend and consolidate, and to extend to the whole Dominion of Canada, the laws respecting the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce—Carried.

EXPENSES, FENIAN INVASION.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on, certain resolutions affirming the expediency of indemnifying the Government for having authorized the issue of a special warrant for \$200,000, to provide for the defence of the Dominion, in repelling the Fenian invasion in the month of May last.

The resolutions having been read a second time,

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS introduced a Bill founded on them.

ELECTION LAW.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 16, to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada—Mr. IRVINE in the chair.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he understood the hon. member opposite intended to make certain amendments to the Bill now before the Committee. He suggested that the amendments should be proposed after the Committee should rise.

Hon. Mr. DORION proposed an amendment to the effect, that the returning officer shall not have the right to question the validity of the electors' list, thereby disfranchising the electors as had been done in certain parishes recently.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he was bound to resist this amendment, for it was calculated to create illegality in the elections. He referred to the Kamouraska election and its irregularities, one of which was the prevention of the returning officer from proceeding with the election. The law, as it existed, was adapted to both provincial and general elections. The returning officer had no jurisdiction over the voters' lists. The law as it stood provided for any illegality, and consequently there was of no necessity for the amendment of the member for Hochelaga.

Mr. CAMERON [Huron] argued that the law of Quebec would not be tolerated in Ontario, and that there was a need of the amendment proposed. The experience of the past, both with regard to the developments before Election Committees and elsewhere, showed the need of defining or restricting the powers of returning officers. Not only in the case of Kamouraska, but in the case of other counties, the greatest irregularities and injustice had resulted from the arbitrary acts of returning officers. The powers of these officials in Lower Canada should certainly be placed within due restriction. They often felt inclined to work for Government candidates, being under Government authority. He certainly thought the Government should accept this amendment, which in the Lower Province seemed greatly needed.

Mr. PELLETIER related the circumstances of the last election for Kamouraska, including the disfranchisement of a couple of large parishes by the returning officer for trivial, if not worse, reasons. One instance of this unjust and arbitrary action was palliated on the ground of the list of voters being a copy and not the original list. He advocated the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON said there was no doubt as to their opinions on both sides of the House agreeing as to the powers of the returning officer, and as to what should be his duties. They all admitted that he should not be the judge as to the qualifications of the electors. If he took a

wrong course there was an appeal to a higher tribunal, an efficient remedy. If that was the law—if the returning officer's duties were at present defined, he saw no necessity for the present amendment.

Hon. Mr. DORION said they on that side of the House had always contended that no such power as was occasionally assumed by returning officers belonged to them. But in the case of Kamouraska and other counties these officers had made themselves the judges in this matter, and disfranchised the electors at their mere will and pleasure. In the case of Kamouraska three parishes had been deprived of the franchise; in the County of Megantic two or three had been deprived of voting. In Drummond and Arthabaska two large municipalities, and in L'Islet one had been subjected by the returning officer to similar hardship and injustice. He desired to put a stop to this species of action, and clearly and finally define the powers of the returning officers.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN thought that if the Returning Officers took on themselves duties which did not belong to them, they should be fined. It was provided that the Returning Officers should take the facts as they were without scrutiny, but the law had been misunderstood, and it required to be made clear so that it could not be misunderstood, and then if the officers transgressed that law they should be fined \$500, and their judgment would then become much more accurate. It was quite sufficient that such irregularities had taken place in four counties, and that the electors had been deprived of their rights in consequence of Returning officers taking on themselves to decide who should not vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) It was quite evident that the law was inconclusive, for even the House could not decide what it really was. The hon. member for Toronto had proposed something similar in another matter, but now when the hon. member for Hochelaga proposed to follow his example, he objected to such being done. The Law Officers of the Crown in Lower Canada had taken a different view of the case from that of the member for Toronto West, and sustained the Returning Officers in their action—and such a decision could not be overlooked. He remembered that on one occasion a gentleman had been elected for a constituency in Quebec, and had received some fifteen hundred votes, when the total number was not one-third of that, and when on that occasion numbers of votes had been recorded in all sorts of fictitious names, the House had taken three years to decide what votes were good. The motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga was simply to state the

law clearly, so as to prevent all abuse, and it was very necessary that this should be done.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON (Toronto West) could not follow the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell, but understood it to be based on the supposition of the law being doubtful, but each case that had occurred proved that there was no doubt. As to the comparison made between the motion of the member for Hochelaga and one made by himself, he could not see any connection. His Bill had been for the relief of persons misunderstanding the law, whereas in the present motion there was no such object.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said that the Returning Officers in Lower Canada had no more judicial power than those in Upper Canada. When, in 1859, it was determined to adopt the system of registration of votes, it was necessary to attach some penalty to those localities which did not choose to register their votes, and it was enacted that where no voters list was prepared, no poll should take place. These voters lists had to be made from the municipal taxation list, and there were many localities in Quebec where no taxation lists were made, and as they could not make voters lists without taxing themselves, they would not make such lists at all except on strong inducement. After the enactment of 1859 a further set of enactments followed, making every possible provision for ensuring the making of such returns. These being somewhat complicated, were, however, repealed in 1863, and a short provision substituted, that no poll should be held until a return of the voters had been made and registered at least one month before the date of the Writ of election. Thus the Returning Officer had no discretion. If a list was handed to him properly authenticated he had to act on it, and if there was no list there was no poll. He did not say that it was impossible for the Returning Officer to make a mistake, but as the law stood there was no excuse for his doing so. The only question with him was one of fact, as to whether there was a proper list or not, thus there might have been mistakes in the past, but there could be none in the future.

Hon. Mr. DORION—Why not?

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN—Because the question was simply whether a list had been made and registered in proper time. What the hon gentleman wanted to enact was, that the returning officer should be required to accept any sheet of paper whatever, that might be placed in his hands, but the law required that he should merely see that it had been properly registered and then act on it.

Mr. Harrison.

Mr. MASSON of Terrebonne, said that whatever the law might be, the returning officers had taken upon themselves the responsibility of setting voters lists aside. As to the remedy for an illegal act of an election committee, they all knew how ill and slowly it worked. An appeal of this sort entailed such expense and delay as to render it almost useless. In many cases municipalities were deterred from this course by its difficulties. The returning officer now acted arbitrarily at times, and there was no doubt his powers should be strictly defined. Let the matter be placed beyond doubt [hear, hear]. He regretted the Bill of last year was defeated. He thought no expense should be spared to secure the full and free expression of the public opinion at elections. He entirely agreed with the views of the member for Hochelaga, and hoped that he would support any Bill, the Government might introduce to secure full and valid voters' lists and proper elections. Last year, however, he, and other opposition members, had resisted and secured the postponement of the Government's measure, which was greatly needed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER explained that the Act for the registration of voters, passed in 1859, had for its object the abolition of just such fraudulent practices as had been referred to as the characteristics of past elections. The result of the measure had been good, as there were few instances at present of the disfranchisement of municipalities or of their failure to qualify for the elections. He explained the nature of the Act, under which, however, certain irregularities had arisen in consequence of the default of Secretary Treasurers. By the Act of 1863 evils of this kind were remedied, it being necessary to make, certify and register the voter's lists a month before the election. The Secretary Treasurers of municipalities must now go before returning officers and have the lists certified in due form. The latter had no arbitrary power of the kind alleged by some members. He explained the occurrence of some of the irregularities that had been referred to, and the cause. Some difficulty and mystification had sprung from the meaning attached to the word "duplicate," as regards Lower Canada. It simply meant a duly certified copy by the proper officer—such ought to be considered a duplicate. He would propose shortly a way of meeting the views of the mover of the amendment, which he hoped would therefore be withdrawn.

Mr. D. MACDONALD said he was glad the Government were willing to meet the

difficulty referred to as having occurred in the case of L'Islet, and other constituencies. The re-election of the member for that county would not have been necessary if the Returning Officer had only accepted the list presented. He had stated to the Parliamentary Committee that he had consulted the Law Officers of the Crown, who had told him that the word "duplicate" was not sufficient, that the word "copy" was the one that should have been used. This difficulty as to the powers and duties of Returning Officers would be obviated by the adoption of the motion of the member for Hochelaga. Thus much trouble and time would be saved. He referred to defects of the law in existence, which threw open the door to evils of a serious character. If his hon. friend wished to leave no discretion to the Returning Officer, cases of this kind would be occurring continually.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER did not think the suggestion of the hon. member was out of the way, and Government would consider it. He suggested an adjournment of the debate.

Mr. IRVINE admitted that the law of Quebec as it now stood was defective and should be changed. It was too bad the electors should be disfranchised through a mere technicality. The fault did not lie with the Returning Officer, but with the Legislature, which permitted such a condition of affairs to exist. It seemed to him that the true way to get rid of this difficulty was to make it the duty of the Returning Officer, to procure a proper copy of the list from the Registrar before the commencement of the elections. The duty of the Returning Officers was no easy one, and it was too bad to subject them to such charges as were brought against them in this House.

Mr. POPE admitted that certain municipalities were disfranchised through not having a voter's list. He thought that in such a case a municipality deserved to be disfranchised. It was their duty to obtain a list, and if they neglected to do so, they should suffer the consequences.

Mr. ROSS (Champlain) said the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga was worse than the evil complained of. It would be better to adopt the suggestion of the Solicitor General of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. DORION was willing to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Militia, and adjourn the Committee.

The Committee rose and reported, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the second reading of an Act for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of the revenue.—Carried.

The Bill was then passed through Committee of the Whole, Mr. Harrison in the chair.

SAVINGS BANKS.

The House went into Committee to consider certain resolutions on the subject of Savings Banks, and also of the issue and redemption of Dominion Notes.

Mr. STREET in the chair.

The seventh clause, at the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Holton, was amended so as to permit the two Savings Banks at Montreal and Quebec to take advantage of the Act.

Other unimportant amendments were made, and the Committee rose and reported.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON inquired whether the repeal of the five per cent duty was intended to take effect immediately, or if not, when. He had just come from Montreal where numerous inquiries had been made regarding the subject.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said they would take effect on the first of April next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Street in the chair.

On the following resolutions giving the Governor in Council power to place on the free list certain raw materials used in Canadian manufactures:—

Resolved—2. That it is expedient to empower the Governor in Council from time to time to transfer to the list of Free Goods, any or all materials (whether natural products or products of manufactures) used in Canadian manufactures.

Resolved—3. That it is expedient to empower the Governor in Council, to admit free of duty any machinery to be used in any Canadian manufactory on satisfactory evidence that like machinery is not then manufactured in Canada.

Resolved—4. That it is expedient to provide that a statement of all such exemptions from duty, under the first two of the previous Resolutions, and of all articles admitted free of duty under the third resolution, be laid before Parliament, within the first fifteen days of the then next Session thereof.

Resolved—6. That it is expedient to provide, that the same duties of customs as are chargeable in Manitoba under the Act of last Session, 33 Vict., chap. 4, shall be chargeable on goods imported into any part of the North Western Territory.

Resolved—7. That it is expedient that

Hon. Mr. Morris.

the first Resolution shall take effect on and from the 16th instant.

The first resolution was passed on the 10th inst.

The fifth resolution was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the first resolution laid down a dangerous principle, and notified the Government that he would oppose it at a future stage of the resolution.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the power thus given was not very great, and was for the purpose of meeting inconveniences which arose from time to time with respect to these articles. If he were sitting on the Opposition side of the House he would not object to giving such power to the Governor.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said with all his confidence in the Government (laughter,) he did not think it advisable to trust them too far with such power on the eve of a general election.

Mr. MACDONALD was averse to granting this power to Government. If there was some special case to be excepted, let it be included in the Bill; that was the proper way to meet the difficulty. He believed that the Government would save themselves a great deal of trouble and suspicion as to their motives, by abandoning their present position.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. OLIVIER thought the Government should encourage Canadian manufactures as much as possible, and with this object encourage the importation of raw material. It was of the utmost importance this country should become a great manufacturing country. It was therefore the duty of the municipalities and of the Government to encourage these enterprises in every way. It was unsafe to leave in the hands of the Government a power, which might be used for political purposes, such as that now solicited, and particularly on the eve of the elections [hear, hear].

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was opposed to any delegation of power properly belonging to the House, to the Government.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the hon. gentleman was opposing what the House had already done in other cases. He referred to the Customs Acts of 1867, which gave power to the Governor in Council to declare that certain goods should be exempt from duty when considered advisable, and that was not a solitary case. The present proposition was, that in cases of articles needed in manufactures carried on in Canada, the Government should have

power to declare that those articles should come in free, and that they should afterwards submit their action to the judgement of the House. He was sorry to have heard a member speak of the undue sympathy given to manufactures, as he thought that every encouragement should be given to those manufactures. On the occasion of a recent visit to Toronto and Hamilton, he was both surprised and gratified to see the hold which the manufactures had got, and he thought that any action that would encourage those industries, should not be objected to. As to the objection to giving the Government discretion in the matter, he would remind the House that the discretion must be lodged somewhere, and if it was not with the Government, it might come to rest with the Collectors, who would be called upon to take the responsibility of saying what articles should be relieved of duty. It was not so easy to sit down and make out a free list, and it would take the House a very long time to make out such a list as would include every proper article. He submitted that the resolutions were in the interest of the country, and gave no undue power to the Government, and also that every case of exemption would be submitted, not only to individual ministers, but would have to pass the ordeal of the Treasury Board, and therefore nothing unadvisable could pass.

Mr. JONES (Halifax,) thought the powers quoted by the Minister of Inland Revenue were in no way equivalent to those now asked. The case of the duty on coal and flour had been a distinct resolution, in which the Government had power to take off that duty provided they were met in the matter by the American Government, but in the present instance it might happen, that any gentleman having sufficient influence, would be able to obtain concessions from the Government to encourage some particular undertaking in which he chanced to be interested, and he thought that such power was neither desirable in the interest of the Country, nor of the Government themselves. He agreed with the hon. member for Lanark on this point, as the Government would then be removed from all suspicion of undue preference to which they might otherwise be liable, and he thought it would be much more advisable to enumerate and define the articles to be placed on the free list. Further, if the Government in this way took on themselves the regulation of the taxation of the country, they took on themselves powers which belonged to that House. He should for these reasons oppose the proposition.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) asked the Minister of Customs whether there

were any articles now admitted free, that could be manufactured in the country.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said there were such articles, for instance castings, shaftings, and locomotives in part or in whole.

Mr. McDONALD understood that it was merely articles that could not be manufactured in Canada that were admitted free, and thought that all articles that could be manufactured here should not be so admitted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) thought the discussion had turned on the relative merits of protection and free trade—but should not continue the discussion in that direction. The question was whether the discretionary power asked for by the Government should be granted, and he certainly considered it ought not. The Minister of Inland Revenue had already very great power in his own Department, and in one case the result of the regulations framed there had been, that in his own county not a single pound of tobacco could be purchased—and he considered that such regulations were a discredit to the Government. He considered that the power asked for by the Government should only be given either when the House was wanting in industry, or when it was wanting in ability to deal with the question—and he thought the best plan would be, that when the Government thought fit they should assume the responsibility of taking off a duty, and afterwards ask indemnity for having done so, and then they would take care to have a good case—and there would be no possibility of their interfering with the rights of the public at large by special favours to individuals.

Mr. BROWN desired to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that there were many articles introduced from the United States duty free, which could just as well be manufactured in Canada, and he thought it very unjust that such should be allowed. He hoped the Minister of Customs would take the matter into his consideration, and not continue to give the Americans this unfair advantage.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that the attention of his Department had already been called to the matter, and enquiries were being made, and steps would be taken to remedy the evil.

The third resolution was then passed.

HEMLOCK BARK.

The fourth resolution was then taken up, providing for an export duty of \$1.50 per cord on Hemlock Bark.

Mr. SCRIVER (Huntington)—He understood that the object of the proposition

was not to raise revenue, but rather to restrict what had been called the whole sale destruction of timber. The imposition, however, as far as he could learn, was based on the representations of a comparatively small body. The result would be the placing in the pockets of a small body of manufacturers, what would be taken away from the poorer classes concerned in the matter. He considered that this article of Hemlock Bark bore the same relation to the settlers of to-day that ashes had done in olden times. In portions of the Eastern Townships the tracts of Hemlock were very extensive, and in consequence of the colonization system now commenced, these tracts were being taken up by settlers who absolutely required the proceeds of the bark in order to support themselves. The value of the timber consisted in its bark, which was peeled off with but little labour, and the price had latterly been much enhanced, it being some eight years ago between \$2 and \$3 a cord, and now ranging from \$4 to \$5. In addition to this, the duty imposed would not be large enough to effect the desired end, as the evil could only be removed by proper measures adopted by those selling the land, and by the adoption of some such restrictive measures as has been adopted in Ontario. In the interest, as he deemed, both of his particular section of the country, and of the country at large, he should oppose the imposition.

Mr. LAWSON was aware that the destruction of timber was very large, in obtaining the bark, but the settlers on the lands required it to carry them on from year to year, and he thought the House had no right to interfere with private rights of individuals. If there were any wild lands containing large quantities of hemlock, and not fit for settlement, then the Government should reserve that timber for future use, but if the land was sold the settlers ought to be able to avail themselves of the bark without the restriction of this duty.

Mr. JOLY (Lotbinière) hoped the Government would not object to his rising to support them. He had paid a good deal of attention to the matter, and thought the measure a very wise one. He spoke in the interest of the very largest undertaking in Quebec, which was also spreading in Ontario—he spoke of the tanning and shoemaking businesses. Their neighbours well understood the value of the hemlock bark. In the Northern States the tanning business was carried on, on a much larger scale than in Canada, and some of the firms there had acquired large tracts of hemlock in their districts, but would not touch those tracts until they

Mr. Scriver

had exhausted the bark supply of Canada, and then when they had done this they could fall on their own stock. If their neighbours wanted to enter into large tanning transactions, let them come to Canada. Labour was so much higher there, that the cost of cutting their own timber would be more than the freight of bark brought from Canada. There was another reason why the Government should impose this duty. Canadian farmers were beginning to suffer from the want of hemlock bark. He spoke principally of the farmers in Quebec, and along the line of the Grand Trunk in the eastern townships, and he appealed to members from the districts in question, whether he was not correct, and he thought they should not deprive themselves of any means of encouraging the industry. The same principle applied to the lumber, which should not leave this country until it had been manufactured into every shape in which it was required, so that Canada could derive the benefit of every process. As to the complaint made by the hon. member for Huntington as to bad lands unfit for cultivation, he admitted that there might be some injustice in such cases, but the public interest should be consulted, and the settlers had never been encouraged to go there by promises of being allowed to make hemlock bark. As timber became scarcer the bark would of course rise, and every one knew that large quantities of fine hemlock were now wasted in order to obtain the bark, which, if preserved, would in time come to be of much more value than the bark was at present. He hoped the resolution would be adopted.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said if this duty were imposed, the price of bark would be so reduced as to make it not worth while to cut it. Hemlock, it was well known, grows on the worst kind of soil, and if it were made non-productive by this tariff, it would be burnt in the usual way in clearing the lands. He hoped the Government would re-consider the matter, and not go too far with this matter.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the views of the Finance Minister on such subjects were well known, in fact they were historic. The proposal now, was to interfere with the trade in hemlock bark so as to prevent people from realizing what they ought to make from the products of the soil. This was opposed to the Confederation Act.

Mr. POPE—Did not the hon. member place an export duty on salt when he was in the Government, (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—Yes, but two wrongs did not make a right. If the

Government followed a bad policy in the past, what were they assembled here for if not for the purpose of amending the laws, (hear, hear). And was it to be said that because a member voted for a measure one year that he must necessarily remain forever committed to it. The House had learned something, perhaps, on this subject by experience, and it was their duty, as representatives of the people, to retrace the evil course which they had entered upon. This proposed duty was most improper, impolitic and unjust to those persons who had bought their lands and paid for them. He had some personal experience as to the importance of preserving this hemlock bark. On his own farm near Toronto there were a good many hemlock trees, and he considered them very useless timber, to be used only when pine could not be had. He did not see that there was any very great necessity for passing this Act for the preservation of hemlock. If there were large tracts of land covered with these trees, perhaps it might be advisable for the Government to protect such tracts. If the policy of the Government was to make money fast in this manner, they should extend the principle to other articles of export, and not allow the people to sell their cattle to the Americans, lest they should deteriorate their stock. It might be applied to almost any article sold to our neighbours, as well as to hemlock bark. Now, he contended that the principle was unsound. He thought that the policy of this country was to encourage free trade, to open the markets and to obtain a reciprocity treaty with our neighbours, so as to exchange with them in the freest manner possible. But it seemed that the hon. members opposite had entered upon this antiquated policy, and very soon, no doubt, we would have the whole export trade of the country brought under it.

Mr. HARRISON understood from the debate, that a large trade had sprung up in the export of hemlock bark to the United States. Now, the Dominion Government wished to regulate this trade, and they had the power to do so, under the Confederation Act, which declared that they had the regulation of trade and commerce.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—It is not to regulate, it is to prevent it altogether (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that the hon. Finance Minister, in moving this resolution, had stated that it was intended to prevent the wholesale destruction of hemlock timber in the country. If so, it was but natural to suppose that the duty should be extended to the essence of hemlock which was manufactured very exten-

sively, and was the cause of the destruction of more trees than the export trade in bark. Nearly all the tanning manufactured was exported, and it was only along the border that bark was cut for exportation.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the reason why a duty had not been placed on tanning was, that its manufacture was calculated to develop the trade of the country. While the United States Government admitted bark free into their country, they placed a tariff which was almost prohibitive on tanning. Now, while the supply of hemlock was comparatively small in the Republic, we had large tracts of country covered with hemlock forests, so that, practically, we had almost a monopoly of it. The policy of the United States Government towards Canada was simply this: to admit in crude form all the products of Canada of which they stood in need, free of duty, but to place a heavy tariff on such products in the manufactured form. This was in order to foster their own industries and to kill ours (hear, hear). It was admitted that hemlock was generally found growing on lands which were of little good for growing anything else, so that the country lost little by protecting these forests. The fact, too, that hemlock bark was becoming valuable, showed that it was time to interfere and prevent the wholesale destruction of our forests. He hoped that this duty would be maintained.

Mr. COLBY thought there should be a tax on property, more for its protection than for the obtainment of revenue. The best way to protect it was to throw the duty upon the owner. This proposition went directly in the face of the policy all the Provinces had for year been contemplating with favour. Was it the right way to invite emigrants and encourage their settlement by imposing a tax upon an article which would be the produce of their labour? If this burden and discouragement were thrown upon articles of export, our settlers would be impeded, injured and driven away. This duty would also injure the railways of the country, besides diminishing the labour of our people and reducing the profits of their work. The main object of the tax proposed was to encourage and benefit the tanners. It was an odious one and calculated to discountenance the settlement and clearing of our forests.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER said this was a great question, a covering one, this bark question (laughter). He must therefore begin high. There was once a great Southern States politician, named Calhoun, who came in contact with an Englishman travelling for his instruction. The latter

remarked to him that the American institutions were not logical, but that the Senate appeared to be logical. He observed, in addition, that he did not understand, however, why a small State should send as many Senators to Congress as a great one. Mr. Calhoun replied there were a great many things in the world which in theory, perhaps, could not be well explained, but in practice, when well handled, worked admirably. In the matter of these duties, then, they might not seem logical, but worked well, and doubtless would continue to. This was a question of trade and of enlarging the domestic industry of the country. There could be no doubt that our manufactures deserved every reasonable encouragement. The Americans were logical in their protection policy. They would admit our bark free of duty, but not the extract of bark, the making of which afforded employment to our people. Though the policy of protecting Canadian manufacture in the way proposed, might not be capable of logical explanation, it could not stand the practical test. He referred to a speech of the member for North Lanark in proof of his former approval of protection.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he had recommended a moderate or incidental protection, and had induced the meeting to lower their demands. To the extent of moderate protection they were all agreed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said incidental protection was what the Government also desired. He had proved even to John Bright that while this was their policy, their customs duties were smaller than those of England—that while the latter amounted to 18s. per head the former were but 9s. He had proved that Canada was more entitled to the name of a free trade country than England.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL—Yes; you “blabbergusted” Bright on that occasion. (Laughter.)

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was glad his victory on that occasion had been recognised. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Dr. TUPPER reviewed some of the remarks and arguments of the member for North Lanark, and contended he had frequently changed his opinions on the question of free trade and protection, and exposed himself to the charge of thorough inconsistency. It became the Government of the country to look at this question in the light of the changed circumstances of Canada. He read a resolution passed at a protection meeting in the West, in favour

of a twenty per cent tariff, at which that member spoke, and asked if he now endorsed those high protection duties. If it was a virtue in a public man to turn a somersets from day to day, in regard to this tariff question, no man could stand as high as the member for North Lanark. It was absurd and extraordinary that one who had so frequently changed his views on this subject, should again advocate free trade doctrines in the House after a very recent protection campaign.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL maintained that the lecture on inconsistency and change just delivered, came with a bad grace from the member for Cumberland, and applied far more appropriately to members on his own side of the House. He contended that there was no parallel between the case of the protection meeting at Toronto and the present one proposed. He endeavoured, and with success, to moderate the opinions of the audience and modify their resolutions. His ground had been consistent all through. He had no objection whatever to such a tariff as was requisite to procure the country all the revenue it needed, and to this extent favoured protection. That was the position he had always held, and he saw in it no impropriety or inconsistency whatever.

Mr. POPE said we must regulate our measures in some proportion to the manner in which our neighbours regulated theirs. He thought the policy of Canada should aim at protecting her resources and finding employment for her people. We should guard our means of industry and our trade, including the hemlock bark already becoming scarce. In face of the difficulties existing on the other side of the line, Canada could not adopt a free protection policy to the same extent as would be necessary.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said nothing was heard of this duty till certain bark factories were established. How could we expect Americans to come here and erect leather factories for the sale of extract of bark, when they could purchase it here and use it on their own side of the line? He condemned any tariff policy, merely prohibiting or impeding the trade in this hemlock bark. That was altogether too small and partial a measure from which to anticipate much benefit. He could see nothing whatever in the argument that this duty was likely to attract Americans here and induce them to establish tanneries. He could not support a duty which was not one for revenue, but merely for protection purposes—for the protection of a dormant interest, and to the injury of a considerable and useful trade.

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

Mr. BOLTON said that no such direful result of the present system was witnessed in New Brunswick as was described of Quebec. In the former the trees were not cut down for the sake of the bark, which was extracted as an incident of the timber trade, not as the main object. To put a duty on bark would hurt the farmers and traders of New Brunswick, who now sold it as well as their timber, and therefrom derived aid in their settlement struggles. The duty was vicious in principle and would create a bad precedent. He would oppose it as it certainly deserved.

Mr. COLBY said this measure was not one for the protection of our forests. If that had been the object, application could be made to the Local Legislature for the purpose. But it was to protect a certain class, and as such he opposed it. He replied at considerable length to the arguments of the Government, contending that as the frontier counties had been most loyal to the Confederation, they deserved greater consideration from the Government than it was proposed to extend to them. It was an unnecessary burden, and would damage the country instead of benefiting it.

Messrs. Pickard, D. A. Macdonald, and Lawson, having spoken, the resolutions were carried, and the 16th inst. fixed as the day for their going into effect.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved the sending of the statement of receipts and expenses for the half year ending December last, to the Printers, in order to prepare for its submission to the Committee on Public Accounts.—Agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 15th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented fourth report from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills. Among other things, the report recommended the extension of time for receiving petitions to the 31st instant. The report was adopted, and the time extended accordingly on motion of Hon. Mr. Sanborn.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL submitted the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. Mr. WARK gave notice that on Monday next he would ask the Government whether it is their intention to

include in the estimates a sum of money providing for the permanent improvement of the harbour of Richibuctou.

JUDGES' SALARIES.

Hon. Mr. MILLER hoped that the Government would be able to give the House and country a satisfactory answer to the question of which he had given notice some days previously. The subject was one which had created a good deal of feeling in the Maritime Provinces,—he spoke more especially of Nova Scotia. It was considered that the policy of making a distinction between the different Provinces as to the salaries given to the Judges was invidious, unjust and unwise, and the sooner it was amended the better for the interests of the whole Dominion. The judges of the Maritime Provinces would bear comparison with those of Ontario and Quebec, and certainly their duties were fully as onerous, especially as in Nova Scotia there were no county judges. In the Province of Nova Scotia, the administration of justice cost less than in Ontario and Quebec. Taking the last census as a guide, he found that service cost nearly eleven cents per head in Ontario; twelve cents and a half in New Brunswick; nine cents and a half in Quebec; and eight cents and two-thirds in Nova Scotia. Therefore, it would be seen that the Government had no valid reason for refusing an augmentation of the salaries of the Judges of Nova Scotia. Without further remarks, he asked whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure during the present session of Parliament to equalize the salaries of the Superior Judges in the various Provinces of the Dominion, by placing the Judges in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick on the same footing with those in Ontario and Quebec?

Hon Mr. CAMPBELL was quite sure that his hon. friend had stated very correctly the state of affairs in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that the Judges deserved the encomiums passed upon them. The Government found them at the time of the Union enjoying the salaries given them by the people of Nova Scotia, who had an opportunity of judging of their merits and knowing whether the amount was sufficient. In New Brunswick there had been some slight increase to the salaries of the Judges. In Ontario and Quebec the Judges were paid the same salaries they had received previous to the Union. Whether that line of reasoning was entirely satisfactory to his hon. friend he did not know, but nevertheless it was obvious there was some degree of justice in the principle of continuing the same

salaries to the Judges as they enjoyed at the time of the Union. He preferred, however, not entering into the discussion of the question at that time, and would content himself with simply replying that it was not the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce any measure on the subject.

THE HARBOUR OF RICHIBUCTOU.

Hon. Mr. WARK called attention to the urgent necessity that existed for the improvement of the Harbour of Richibuctou, N. B., where the channels were continually shifting in the bar that lay at the entrance of that port. Navigation was constantly impeded, and commerce was exposed not merely to great inconvenience but to heavy losses, in consequence of the want of the improvement he pressed on the attention of the Government. In 1868 the Government of the Dominion were urged by a deputation which came up from that place, to take some steps to improve the harbor. Mr. Page was sent down to examine it and made his report in due season. That gentleman had an opportunity of referring to the report of Captain Bayfield, and to another by Mr. Keefer. Mr. Boyd had also visited the locality previous to Mr. Page. It would be remembered by the Postmaster General that he (Mr. W.) had applied on behalf of the port of Richibuctou for steam accommodation—that one of the steamships plying between the upper and lower ports should call occasionally, on the downward trip, at Richibuctou. It was stated, however, in answer to the application, that the harbor was not sufficiently safe to allow the passage of the steamers; and, therefore, the Government would at once see the necessity of promptly dealing with the matter. Before the Union, the people of the locality obtained a grant of \$20,000 from the Local Legislature for the purpose of improving the harbor, but that sum subsequently merged into the general treasury, and the people of Richibuctou were consequently called upon to make another sacrifice for Confederation. Indeed, a contract was let out on the faith of the grant, but the person who took it had to stop, after he had sunk \$8,000, not a dollar of which was ever returned to him inasmuch as he had not fulfilled his obligation. The difficulty in his case arose from mismanagement and not from the impracticability of the undertaking. He noticed that there were considerable sums given for the improvement of the harbours of Amherst Island and Mabou, in Cape Breton, and though he did not doubt that those were desirable public improvements, he thought they were by no means of such urgent

necessity as that which he was pressing upon the favorable consideration of the Government. The work would not probably cost more than \$40,000, if as much, and he earnestly trusted that no time would be lost in making an appropriation for so useful a public purpose. The port of Richibuctou now returned a considerable revenue to the Customs, and would give quadruple the amount if its improvement was accomplished, and vessels were not exposed to the risks they were now obliged to run on account of the absence of the necessary facilities. If the Government granted money for the improvement of Mabou, they could hardly refuse to make an appropriation for one of more pressing necessity.

Hon. Mr. MILLER differed from the hon. member on that point.

Hon. Mr. WARK concluded by again calling the attention of the Government—especially of the Postmaster General—to the importance of the subject. The enquiry he had on the paper was comparatively trivial, but he had given notice of one for Monday, more immediately referring to the subject, and he fervently trusted that the Hon. Postmaster General would be able by that time to give him a definite answer to a question in which he naturally felt the deepest interest. Without asking the further indulgence of the House, he would enquire of the Government what amount of tonnage duty has been collected at the Port of Richibuctou under the Act to provide means for improving the harbours and channels at certain Ports in the Province of the Dominion, and how much of the said duty has been expended for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that he was surprised to find that the hon. gentleman had made a speech which went far beyond the range of the enquiry, but before referring to the remarks of the hon. member, he would answer the question by stating that during the fiscal year of 1870, the amount of tonnage duty was \$1,978 40, and for the half year ending 31st December, 1870, \$886; or a total sum of \$2,864.40. In the passage of the Act under which the duty was collected he had himself assisted, and in order to show that the people of Richibuctou had received more than the amount of the trifling tax contributed by the shipping, he mentioned that \$4000 had been given to a tug-boat for the accommodation of that locality. It had been, therefore, with much surprise that he had heard the hon. member attempt to censure the Government for not having taken a sufficient interest in the improvement of the port in question; but still

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

more astonished was he to find that same hon. gentleman accusing the Local Government of New Brunswick, previous to the Union, with having perpetrated a gross act of injustice to the people of Richibuctou.

Hon. Mr. WARK explained that he had only stated that the money was granted but subsequently merged into the public chest in consequence of Union.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL went on to say that the grant in question was made for the improvement of the harbours of the North Shore, and not Richibuctou alone.

Hon. Mr. WARK said that it was made at the instance of the people of Richibuctou. The improvements were to begin at that place, and anything left was to go to other ports.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said that the legislature certainly made the appropriation for the whole of the North shore. Now, that grant was made 15 or 17 years ago, and although the hon. member was in the Government for seven or eight years, and a member of the legislature, having the control of the appropriation of the money, yet he never pressed its expenditure for the object for which it was intended. The fact was, the hon. gentleman was afraid to let out the secret why the grant was allowed to lapse. The contractor referred to, was unable to carry out his contract, because the improvement was impracticable, and on that account it was dropped. As respects the improvements of Mabou and Amherst Island harbours, they were absolutely necessary for the safety of life and property [hear, hear]. The improvement of Richibuctou might be very important to commercial interests, but that of the ports just mentioned was still more useful, since they were harbours of refuge. He did not deny the advisability of improving Richibuctou, but he felt still more the necessity of making such improvements as those called in question so unwarrantedly. Off Port Hood, there were at times as many as 200 or 300 vessels.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—Night after night for weeks.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—Along a coast line of 100 miles of the valuable island of Cape Breton, there were only Port Hood and Mabou—not a single other port where a fishing smack of 50 tons could enter and lie securely. As respects Amherst Island, it would be seen by reference to the last Report on Marine and Fisheries, just presented to the House, that there were some 160 vessels lying there one time last season. By reference to the estimates it would be noticed that there was a very large appropriation proposed for dredging

on the North Shore. An iron steam dredge was now being built in Scotland for the purpose of working on that shore, and Richibuctou would be treated like other places. It would be in better taste for the hon. gentleman to consider all the facts of the question before making such assertions and charges, as he had made that afternoon, and to attempt to depart from the traditionary policy of the county which he represented, instead of placing himself in a position of antagonism to the Government on every occasion, and thereby really injuring the very interests he professed to have so much at heart. The policy of the Government respecting the improvement of the Harbours of the Dominion was one which he felt sure obtained the warm approval of all sections; and that was to take up first those which were Harbours of Refuge—indispensable to the safety of life (hear.)

Hon. Mr. FOURINOT had listened with the most unfeigned satisfaction to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Marine respecting the necessity of improving an important harbour in the Island of Cape Breton. The policy of the Government, as enunciated that afternoon, merited the warm approval of every member of the House, and would be appreciated by the people of Cape Breton, whose interests were too often neglected. He hoped that the improvements would not be confined to one locality, but would be extended in the course of time to the eastern coast of the Island.

Hon. Mr. WARK replied that he had not brought any charges whatever against the Government of New Brunswick, and denied that the work of improving the Harbour of Richibuctou had been found impracticable at any time. The channels constantly shifted, and therein lay the difficulty. Soon after the contractor failed to perform the contract in question—through mismanagement—the channel was found to have undergone a change for the better, and no necessity arose for a long time afterwards for improving it; not, in fact, whilst he was in the Government. Latterly, however, it had undergone a change for the worse, and improvement was imperatively required. So far as the constituency was concerned, it was not opposed to the Government—certainly the gentleman who represented it came out as one of their supporters. He (Mr. Wark) had not taken exception to the improvements of Mabou and Amherst Island, but simply questioned the justice of the policy of leaving a port of the commercial importance of Richibuctou untouched, although the necessity of improving it had been long ago acknowledged.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL stated that the reason why the money granted by the Local Government was not expended was because it was known beyond doubt that \$20,000 was altogether inadequate to make any permanent improvement. As respects the remarks of the hon. gentleman concerning the representation of the county—

Hon. Mr. LOCKE raised a question of order, there was no motion before the House.

Hon. Mr. SPEAKER said that the House had last session adopted the practice of the House of Lords in allowing considerable latitude to members in making enquiries regarding motions of the character before the House.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN did not think the practice justifiable; a discussion should come up regularly, or else much confusion must arise, and an end would be put to everything like legislative order. It was clearly for the interest of the Government that some limit should be put to the remarks of hon. gentlemen in cases like the present; it would be clearly impossible for them to meet all the charges that might be brought against them under the guise of simple enquiries. Such debates should come up in accordance with the strict rules of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN said, that formerly an enquiry was simply made, and the answer given with the same brevity. The House had decided last session that, following the practice of the House of Lords, some little latitude might be given on such questions to members, but at all events it was understood that their remarks would be confined to the subject matter. In the present instance, however, other and very extraneous matters had been introduced by both gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST thought that it would be as well to decide at once the question of order.

Hon. Mr. SPEAKER referred to the practice of the House of Lords, where a considerable license in such cases permitted even when no question was really before the House. It had been shown last year that a great many debates had taken place on simple questions of enquiry. It was, however, for the House to decide whether it should adopt such a practice as a rule or not.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL only wished to make a simple explanation, drawn from him by the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Kent. In referring to the traditional policy of the hon. member, he wished to recall the time when the hon. gentleman, on account of squabbles which arose out of his want of moderation and discretion, only succeeded in injuring the interests of Kent.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

Hon. Mr. WARK said that he had not accused the Government of neglect, but had merely referred to the question that afternoon in his anxiety that the Postmaster General, to whom he especially alluded as the leader of the Cabinet in that House, might be prepared with an answer when the question, of which notice had been given, came up in due order. When he had been in the Local Government of New Brunswick, there was no necessity, as he had already stated, for improving the harbour; but now it was very different. As respects the question of the representation of the county, he did not see that the position of a member of the Government was necessarily influenced by the representation of the county in which he might reside—at all events, if that were the rule, then the hon. Minister of Marine would be in a quandary; for there was no one in the Commons less unwilling to give support to the Government than the representative of the very county where he had been living himself. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL replied that when questions of the kind asked by the hon. member were submitted, it was expected that he, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, would answer them. As respects the hon. member just mentioned, the Government never expected support from him. He (Mr. M.) had had to fight him for many years, and he had invariably beaten him. Had he chosen to contest the seat the last time, he would certainly have beaten him out of sight; and he could do the same to-day. The hon. member for Kent himself, he might add, was not supported in the hostile attitude he had taken by the Local representative of the county.

ASSIMILATION OF THE CURRENCY.

Hon. Mr. LOCKE presented a petition from Halifax against any change in the currency.

NORTH SHORE R. R.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill to exempt the North Shore Railroad Company from constructing draw-bridges across navigable rivers. He stated that it was intended to alter the Bill in Committee so as to make it general in its application.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER approved of the Bill and referred to the frequency of accidents in connection with draw-bridges.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD said that some power should be given to the Government to exempt important rivers like the Ottawa from the operation of such a Bill, in case it should be necessary. No steps should be taken which might injuriously affect the

navigation of a river, which must, sooner or later, become the great route for the Western trade. The power asked for was very great, and should not be hastily granted to any single man.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that the Bill had been introduced before the petition was reported on.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that a slight mistake had occurred, but the petition had been reported on that day; besides it was not proposed to make the Bill of a general character.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that he did not intend to press the objection, under the circumstances, and added that too much care could not be taken in framing a measure affecting such important interests. Navigable rivers were the great natural highways of the country, and they should not be interfered with in any way except by direct legislation. The Legislature should in all cases know exactly what was to be done.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he appreciated the objections of the hon. gentlemen, and did not propose to pass the measure hastily, but to have it printed as amended, and then allow sufficient time for the House to consider it.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said that the height of the Victoria Bridge was far beyond that of steamers and vessels passing under it, and the one at St. Anne's was also sufficiently high. A clause might be put in the Bill making a certain height necessary.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that the navigable rivers must be protected for the good of the whole country. Some authority should be left in the hands of the Government to deal with the matter; no fixed legislation could arrange it satisfactorily.

Hon. Mr. WARK thought that the matter could be referred to the Governor in Council, and certainly some notice to interested parties should be given, so that they might oppose the application if necessary.

Hon. Mr. RYAN preferred leaving the matter in the hands of the Legislature to giving it to a Minister of the Crown, who might be swayed by local influence. An injury might be done to a river and then the only remedy was to pull down the structure. The argument with respect to accidents on draw bridges was not altogether good; if sufficient attention was paid to the management of the roads and bridges, these casualties would not so often occur. He looked upon the rivers of the country as the great channels of commerce—railways were but of secondary importance. He would hesitate to accede to the principle of giving to any

Minister of Public Works the right of deciding what was, and what was not, a proper bridge for a river. He would rather that the law remained as at present.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to a Committee on that day week.

THE CENSUS.

In pursuance with the order of the day, the House went into Committee on the Bill to amend the Census Act. Hon. Mr. WARK in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill with one amendment.

The Report was adopted.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th March, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Messrs. SIMARD and TOURANGEAU presented petitions from merchants, ship-owners and others, of Quebec, for the repeal of the duties on grain, flour and coal.

REPORTS.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER laid on the table the annual report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the year ending June 30, 1870.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN asked when the correspondence between New Brunswick and the Dominion, relative to the adjustment of the accounts between them, would be brought down.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER replied he would enquire.

In reply to Mr. Thompson, of Haldimand.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER stated the annual report of the Militia Department would be ready in a few days.

MANITOBA INLAND REVENUE.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved, that on Friday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions, declaring it expedient to amend section 7 in the Inland Revenue Act, 1868, 31 Vic, cap 50, and section 29 of Act 33 Vic., cap 3; to establish and provide for the Government of Manitoba.—Carried.

THE COLLECTION OF THE REVENUE.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the third reading of the Act for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of the revenue.—Carried.

SAVINGS BANKS.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the Savings Banks resolutions, and those respecting the issue and redemption of Dominion Notes.—Carried.

The resolutions were agreed to, and the Bills founded thereon were introduced by the Hon. Finance Minister, and read a first time. He said it had been thought most convenient to introduce two distinct Bills on those subjects.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of Ways and Means.

On the resolution authorizing the Governor in Council, to admit under certain circumstances the raw materials of manufactures free,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought this solicited power too extensive to confer upon the Government. It was a discretion too great in the interests of the country to be allowed Ministers. He moved that the said resolution be not concurred in, but that it be resolved that, in the opinion of the House, it is inexpedient to clothe the Executive Government with power to determine what articles shall be admitted free of duty.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS replied that after the discussion on this subject yesterday, he was surprised at the present objection. If he were on the opposition side, he would not take any exception to the resolution at this stage.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Come and try.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—The Government had no disposition to abuse the power asked.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that he did not fear the Government would make improper use of the power solicited, but, nevertheless, he thought a discretion of this kind should not be entrusted to the Government. The principle was vicious and foreign to the spirit of our constitution. As the motion would sanction a bad precedent, he must oppose it.

A division was then taken on the motion with the following result: yeas 37, nays 84.

The motion for the second reading of the second resolution was carried.

The third resolution authorizing the admission free, of any machinery required in Canadian manufactures was also carried, as was also the fourth, providing for a statement of all the raw material and manufactures admitted in virtue of the foregoing resolutions being laid before

Parliament within fifteen days after the opening of next session.

With regard to the 5th,

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he would ask leave to withdraw the proposal of an export duty on hemlock bark. (Cheers.) He did so in deference to the opinions of many members though it was admitted a necessity for some means of protection to this bark did exist. Thinking the duty might interfere with some departments of trade, and perhaps injuriously affect settlers or farmers, and yielding to the sense of a considerable portion of the House, the Government withdrew the present resolution.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was not disposed to exult in this change of Ministerial views as such, but was glad a wrong principle and course, had been abandoned. While ready to condemn an evil course, he was willing to applaud an improved one. He was glad the resolution had been withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL was glad of the Government's action in this matter. He congratulated the Government in their decision, and the member for Stanstead in the able speech on this subject, which seemed to have produced such good effect on the House and Ministry. This incident conveyed a good lesson respecting the benefits derivable from an honest and vigorous expression of opinion on the part of the supporters of the Government, and also as to the impropriety of Ministers like the President of the Council lecturing hon. members upon inconsistency or change of views (cheers and laughter). He was sorry to see that the President of the Council had left his seat just before the withdrawal of this resolution. He hoped he was not one of those who "fight and run away, that they may fight another day." It was now seen that the Government could change its mind as quickly as before, and as promptly as could private members. He was gratified, for his part, at the present change (hear, hear.)

Mr. JOLY referred to England's policy respecting Free Trade, and the results which had sprung from that, and hoped the time would come when the country in its commercial policy would consult its own interests, and not allow itself to be led by any mere theory.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT thought the Government was perfectly right in withdrawing the duty, and called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that there were other export duties on articles of lumber pressing unfairly on a portion of the population, which he hoped to see taken off. The matter had already been before a Committee of the House, which had reported that the duty was to render

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

perfectly useless a quantity of valuable timber which might otherwise be profitably made use of.

Mr. McDONALD (Glengarry), thought the country was indebted to the Minister of Finance, for coming forward so frankly and withdrawing the duty, but thought the House was entitled to some explanation from the President of the Council and the Minister of Agriculture, of the extraordinary short time in which they had changed their views, they having expressed themselves so very decidedly on the evening previous in support of the resolution.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said he did not see that he was in any way called upon to make any explanation. He had on the previous evening been careful to say nothing as to the necessity or non-necessity of the duty, and the proposal of the Government had been simply to place the bark on the same footing as the extract, as the United States admitted the former free, while the latter was subjected to duty. He had only changed his opinion on the point in the matter, namely, that while on the previous day he had thought that the imposition of the duty would have been supported by a majority of the House he did not now think so.

Mr. COLBY said that personally and on behalf of those gentlemen who had so strongly urged the previous evening that the duty should not be imposed, he thanked the Government for the deference that had been paid to their opinions and congratulated them that although they could not have been unaware that they would be charged with inconsistency, they had, nevertheless, not been deterred from expressing their views, and he thought that none but a strong Government could have taken such a course.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER could not understand how the member for Glengarry could suppose that he was called upon to explain a change of opinion. Of course, in connection with his colleagues, he was responsible for the proposal to impose the duty, but if the observations he had addressed to the House had been properly reported his hon. friend would search in vain for one single word in favor of the duty. He had expressly stated that he would add nothing to what his colleagues had said as to the reasons which led them to submit the proposition, and had in no way expressed his own opinion. He read from the speech of the Hon. Finance Minister, who had stated expressly that the Government did not attach very much importance to the subject, but that in consequence of strong representation and petitions made to them, they made the

proposal and left it entirely to the House to decide,—and now, on finding that the duty did not obtain the favourable consideration of the House, they were certainly in a position to withdraw their resolution. He then referred to a remark of the member for North Lanark, who had, he understood taken advantage of his being called from his seat to throw a taunt across the House, to the effect that he had not the courage to face the charge, and defend himself against the charge of inconsistency, and had, in fact, classed him as being among those who are said to “fight and run away,” so that they might be able to “fight again another day.” Now he thought that hon. gentleman was the very last who could taunt anyone with the want of courage. If he (Dr. Tupper) had never been known to do anything like what the hon. member for North Lanark had done, if, when placed in a position of grave responsibility, where a little courage might have removed all the difficulty he had, instead of exhibiting that courage and meeting the difficulty, thrown all the danger on the shoulders of another, and had himself run away from the scene of danger, then some such charge might have been preferred against him.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL — To what does the hon. gentleman allude?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he alluded to what was a matter of history.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised a question of order. Although he had not the slightest objection to the President of the Council and the member for North Lanark fighting out the matter on any suitable occasion, he thought it would be very inconvenient if they were led away from the subject of discussion. In justice, however, to the member for North Lanark, he must say that he thought it was entirely without precedent for a member of the Government to carry the debate away from the question at issue, in order to make a direct attack on any member of the House.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER bowed to the call to order but was not aware that he had been wrong in showing the hon. member for North Lanark that he was not in a position to make the charge he had made—and he might say that he should never run away from the hon. gentleman, as he certainly thought his bark very much worse than his bite.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL rose to reply, but the speaker ruled that the discussion was entirely out of order, as the motion before the House was the withdrawal of the resolution of placing an export duty on hemlock bark, to which question the members should confine themselves.

Hon. Mr. HOLTQN thanked the Government for the concession made to the expressed opinion of the House.

Mr. LAWSON also desired to express his satisfaction on the withdrawal of the resolution. He referred to the export duty on certain classes of timber, which, when it had previously been discussed, he thought should have received the same opposition as had been offered in the present instance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) congratulated the Government on the celerity they had shown in changing their views in order to meet the wishes of the majority. He did not think, however, that the motion should be quietly withdrawn, but thought the Government should have an opportunity of voting against their own proposition. Whether such an opportunity should be afforded them, would require some deliberation, and he therefore moved that the House should adjourn.

On motion for adjournment being put, Hon. Mr. McDougall said he was opposed to the motion, but thanked the mover for having given him an opportunity of saying what a short time before he had been prevented from saying. He had too much respect for the rules of the House to take the line of reply to which the provocation given by the Hon. President of the Council, had at first tempted him—especially in view of the very serious events at present taking place in the section of the country to which the hon. gentleman had alluded. He thought, under the present circumstances, it became them all not to add any fuel to the flame which he feared had been kindled in that portion of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman, the President of the Council, had, however, taunted him with lacking courage, with having put forward another into a position which he himself feared to occupy; and he would remind the House of the circumstances in which he been placed, that for upwards of forty days he had remained in a position in which he exposed not himself only, but all who were with him, to the daily risk of assassination, waiting and expecting that the Government, which had sent and commissioned him, would give him such instructions as the circumstances required, and then found that they were in communication with those in arms against the authority of the country, and who were seeking his life. The hon. gentleman knew this well, and he knew also that the place where he (Mr. McDougall) remained was without a parallel in the whole of the United States, that the people were an assemblage of outlaws, men, fugitives from justice, who had thus fled to the very confines of the country, and that

Hon. Mr. Holton.

the very man in whose house he had to stay, had himself been charged with murder. Then, being placed in this position, when he found that the Government had left him in the lurch, when they refused to carry out what they had promised to do, he had come back. As to the charge that he had sent a gentleman on an expedition which he himself feared to undertake, he could only say that that gentleman was most anxious to be sent, and wrote him a communication pressing the matter. Surely the President of the Council could not insinuate that it was his (Mr. McDougall's) duty to have led that enterprise. Although the officer in question had been charged with great indiscretion in connection with this matter, he was glad that the Government had recognized his loyalty by employing him at the seat of Government. Under all these circumstances, he thought the hon. gentleman might well have spared his taunt. If the spirit so shown evinced the view taken by him and his colleagues, he (Mr. McDougall) was quite ready to carry the case before the country. He now knew the feelings of the people on the subject, and he would advise the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, in view of the ensuing elections, and in view of the unfortunate events now transpiring in the North West, to adopt a different line of argument, and to be influenced by a different spirit from that which had induced the President of the Council to utter the taunt.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER did not wish to prolong the discussion, but the hon. gentleman had appealed to him to corroborate the courage which he had evinced, and the dangers to which he had been exposed. He could only say that it was not in his power to do so, as the hon. gentleman would remember that he had left him on the plains white with fear, flying from what he considered the most terrible dangers,—and also that, undeterred by anything he heard of these dangers, he (Hon. Dr. Tupper) went quietly forward to the place in which the hon. gentleman had considered himself in daily risk of his life, and found that there was no danger whatever, except the danger that might result from the gross imprudence of which the hon. gentleman himself had been guilty in that place. He found that any peaceable person was just as safe in the neighborhood of Pembina as he would have been in Ottawa. The hon. gentleman would also remember that he (Dr. Tupper) had taken a young boy with him into the heart of the country, and that the first thing Mr. Riel knew of him, was when he knocked at the door of the Council House, at Fort Garry. He thought

therefore, that the hon. gentleman, on comparing notes with him, was hardly in a position to make the statement he had done, by which he (Dr. Tupper) had been betrayed into making a reference, that he otherwise might not have done. The hon. gentleman, however, had so far forgotten his position in the House, as to refer to a gentleman who could not be present to confront him. That gentleman's greatest crime was, that when the hon. member for North Lanark, took upon himself the fearful responsibility of stealing across the boundary under cover of the night, to pretend to assume the Government of a country in which he could not show himself, that gentleman, holding a commission from the Government to administer the Oaths of office, in the North West, represented to the friends and advisers of the hon. member for North Lanark, who accompanied him, one as Secretary, and another as Solicitor General, that he believed the step would be mischievous in the last degree, and used all the weight of his influence to prevent the step being taken, a step which had resulted in involving a great loss of public money, a great amount of difficulty, and the most lamentable occurrences—all of which would have been prevented had the hon. gentleman listened to the wise counsels of the gentleman to whom he had referred—and whom he could not forgive for having entertained views and sentiments which would have saved the country a vast amount of expenditure, and prevented the most deplorable events that had ever occurred in that country. He apologised to the House for having occupied so much time, but as the hon. gentleman had called upon him to confirm statements which were the reverse of being correct, and as he had so forgotten his position as to attack a gentleman who could not reply, he had felt bound to state what he knew of the matter.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS did not rise to protract the discussion, but felt compelled to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for North Lanark. That gentleman had stated the position of the Government with regard to him, and had expressed his readiness to discuss the whole subject before the country. He did not think, however, that the hon. gentleman had omitted any opportunities of placing the matter before the public. The hon. gentleman, however, had made a distinct charge that the Government had "left him in the lurch." Now where were the facts? The very day that the letter had been received, announcing events which took the Government most completely by surprise, an answer was sent to it, and if the hon. gentleman before

taking further action, had allowed himself sufficient time to receive an answer, which in reality reached him some four days before it could have been expected, all difficulty would have been avoided. He did not desire to assail the hon. gentleman with regard to his conduct, but it had been made a constant charge by the Opposition throughout Ontario, that the Government had abandoned the hon. gentleman, and "left him in the lurch." What course could the Government have taken other than that it had taken? Could they have characterised the imprudent Proclamation issued by the hon. gentleman as legal and authorised, and could they have supported that Proclamation? They merely informed the hon. gentleman that they could not take that responsibility, and they expressed their regret at what he had done. He must say that whenever these discussions had arisen, they had been on the provocation of the hon. gentleman himself and not on that of the Government. The members of the Government made every allowance for the difficulties of his position and sympathised with him, but it did not follow that they should take the responsibility of supporting a course which they deemed to be illegal. He had not desired to speak, but he had felt called upon to enter his protest against the Government being charged with having left the hon. gentleman "in the lurch."

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that perhaps, as the Minister of Finance had stated, that every case of controversy on this subject had been provoked by the member for North Lanark. He would say how that gentleman had provoked a certain pamphlet which had been published under Government influence—as he thought that pamphlet appeared when all controversy had ceased, and when there was a general acquiescence in the Government measures for the establishment of a Government in the North West, and when the passions aroused by the unfortunate events in that part of the country had well nigh subsided. That pamphlet had come like a clap of thunder in a clear sky, and without any apparent provocation.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the hon. gentleman could not be unaware of the fact, that speeches against and assaults upon the Government had been constantly made and published long before the appearance of the pamphlet.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said that with reference to the charges made by the member for North Lanark, that he had been deserted by the Government, and that communications had been opened with his enemies, and that he had been left in the perilous and dangerous position he

had pointed out, he could only say, not only that those statements could not be proved, but the Government could prove the very reverse. He might say that from the moment when the hon. member for North Lanark read in that House a letter that he had sent to the leader of the Government, in which he, one of his colleagues, had levelled at his conduct and character the most unfounded charges, he considered that nothing that hon. gentleman could say or do was worth the notice of a gentleman. As to the pamphlets that had been spoken of, he remembered having seen one pamphlet which was supposed to have emanated from a conspicuous member of the Opposition, and on running his eye over it, he had marked in the margin before he got to the end no fewer than twenty-two falsehoods. Last year on the arrival of the hon. member in Ottawa, and indeed for some time previous they had heard breathings of vengeance denounced against everyone who did not agree with him, but he (Mr. Howe) had taken no notice of them. For four weeks after the hon. gentleman's return the press had been flooded with personal and gross abuse of himself and others, his colleagues, but he (Mr. Howe) had never written a line in reply, as he did not think it worth while doing so. He had waited until he could confront the hon. gentleman in that House, and their he dealt with his public policy and conduct, and after that hon. gentleman had had plenty of time to make his complaints and announce his policy, the House decided against him by an immense majority, only eleven persons supporting his scheme. Since then he had not considered the hon. gentleman's position sufficiently important to call for any notice either in the press or in pamphlets, but he was there in his place ready to defend himself and the Government to which he belonged.

Mr. F. JONES (Leeds and Grenville) referred to the remark of the member for North Lanark as to the appointment of a certain gentleman to a Government position. He was opposed to that appointment, not only because it would increase the expense of the civil Government, but because he did not think the conduct of the gentleman in question either at Fort Erie, or at Fort Garry justified his appointment, and he should oppose it at the proper time.

The motion for adjournment was withdrawn, and the matter dropped.

The motion for the withdrawal of the resolution imposing an export duty on hemlock bark was then resumed.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he would support with pleasure the motion of his old

Hon. Mr. Howe.

friend and teacher, the Finance Minister, for leave to withdraw this resolution; and as he desired the fact to be distinctly recorded in the journals of the House he would call for a division and the recording of the yeas and nays.

The motion was then put to a vote and carried.—Yeas 112, nays 14.

The resolutions were read a second time, and a bill founded on them was introduced and read a first time.

BILL FROM THE SENATE.

A Bill from the Senate to extend to the Province of Manitoba certain laws relating to timber, was received and passed.

UNIFORM CURRENCY.

The Bill to establish one uniform currency for the Dominion was read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole—Mr. D. A. Macdonald in the Chair.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) hoped the Hon. Minister of Finance would postpone the operation of the Act, so far as it related to Nova Scotia, till January, 1872. He moved an amendment to that effect.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said such a suggestion, if adopted, would give rise to dissatisfaction in Nova Scotia. It was better to make the change at once, for it must come sooner or later. The fact was that those who wished for delay were opposed to the assimilation in toto, while those who favoured the change did not desire any delay.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the delay asked for was only six months, and since this change was looked upon as grievous, it would be as well to grant the request of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SAVARY would oppose the amendment. He could speak for his own constituents and say that they asked for no delay.

After some further discussion, the Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

AFTER RECESS.

The following Bills were read a second time and passed through Committee of the Whole :—

BILLS PASSED.

No. 19. An Act to authorize the incorporated Village of Trenton to impose and collect Harbour dues, and for the other purposes—Mr. Brown.

No. 28. An Act to extend the provisions of the Act authorizing the imposition and

collection of Harbour dues by the Corporation of the Town of Owen Sound (as amended by Committee on Private Bills)—Mr. Snider.

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply,

Mr. STREET in the chair.

The following items were passed :—

Militia and Defence.....	\$27,930 00
Secretary of State.....	22,827 50
Secretary of State for the Pro-	
vinces.....	16,630 00
Receiver General.....	15,950 00
Finance.....	36,307 50
Customs.....	21,940 00
Inland Revenue.....	18,150 00

On the item of \$40,000 for Public Works,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON stated he observed a marked increase in the item for the Department of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the business of the Department had largely increased since 1868. That year the communications despatched numbered 2,740; in 1870, 3,639. In the past year, 1,600 more letters were received than formerly. This great increase of correspondence necessitated the increase of the staff by two clerks.

Item carried.

Post Office.....	\$52,520 00
Agriculture and Statistics.....	21,900 00

On the item of \$16,725 for Marine and Fisheries,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON complained of the increase in this item to the extent of \$2,515.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied that the construction of new Light Houses entailed the employment of a general superintendent and constructive engineer, at a salary of \$2,000. This outlay was necessary, and calculated to benefit the public service.

After some discussion on the subject of the item for the Marine and Fisheries Offices in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and others,

Mr. BURPEE said the Light Houses were not well placed on the St. John River, owing, perhaps, to the superintendent not knowing the best localities for them. Notwithstanding, however, they had proved of some use.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON stated it had been admitted that some of the Light Houses were not constructed and placed as they should have been. This statement was, no doubt, correct. He did not complain of unreasonable light house expenditure, but only as to the mode of this outlay.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in reply to the member for Glengarry, explained the necessity for proper Light Houses on the St. John River, owing to the heavy fogs, and considerable night navigation. The best at-

tainable improvement had been secured as to the most suitable places for the five lights set up. The expense was moderate, and the majority of the people interested were satisfied with the manner in which it was incurred.

Mr. D. MACDONALD said he brought no charge against the Marine and Fisheries Department. He had merely stated he thought that all these Light Houses and similar works should be placed under the of charge a single department. He had no objection whatever to the money expended in the Lower Provinces, or in any other section, but desired to see the country get the full value for it, (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL disapproved of placing any public buildings under any other than the Public Works Department. The law did not, as the Minister of Customs stated, place all Light Houses under the value of \$10,000, under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The other department was large and well enough supplied to enable it to manage all such public buildings. It was unsafe in the public interests to withdraw from the engineering staff of the Public Works Department, works of this character, and to put them under the charge of another department less competent to manage them.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said when there was any engineering difficulty to overcome—when the works were of a difficult, or scientific character—they were left in the hands of the Public Works Department. The Marine Department was better able to conduct these particular works from its possession of officers enjoying local knowledge the officers of the other departments were not possessed of. The Public Works Department was in no such advantageous position to deal with this class of Public Works as that of the Minister of Marine.

In reply to Mr. MILLS, who wished to know how and why the Public Works Department outlay had increased?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had explained everything necessary on the subject.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the arrangement in this respect made by the Government, was made with the view of economy. Division of labour was intended to secure both efficiency and economy.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the gist of the argument was that the Minister of Public Works, ought to be charged with these works entrusted to the Minister of Marine. Ministers by withdrawing works of this kind from the Department that ought to be charged with them, reflected severely upon it.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER explained and defended the arrangement by which those

Lighthouses had been undertaken by the Marine and Fisheries Department.

The item ultimately passed.

The Treasury Board Office, \$3,000; Finance Offices, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, \$7,500; Marine and Fisheries Office, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, \$8,100. The remaining items were carried, making the total under this head \$525,908: Contingencies, \$150,000; Administration of Justice, Miscellaneous, \$10,000; to provide for the Administration of Justice in Manitoba and the North West Territory, \$10,000.

In answer to Hon. Mr. McDougall,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said Judge Johnson, formerly Recorder and Judge for the Hudson's Bay Company, has been appointed Judge in the North West at the salary he enjoyed before. That gentleman had discharged his preliminary duties well, and as the fruit of his labours a Bill for creating a criminal system in the North West would shortly be discussed in the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for information respecting the item in the Public Accounts granted Sheriff Powell for services in connection with the discovery and arrest of the murderer of D'Arcy McGee.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER stated nothing went to the Sheriff personally, but merely to meet expenses relating to that service. In this matter, it was evident full explanations could not be given. The proceedings were, of course, of a secret character.

Dominion Police \$25,000. With respect to this item,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought it was time to reduce the expenses under this head.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL followed in the same strain, thinking the item incongruous and unnecessary, and expressing unbelief as to future Fenian raids.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER referred to the necessity for a Dominion force in connection with Foreign or Fenian attacks on our country. We all remember our incredulity in relation to the Fenian attack of last May. There had been false reports of coming raids and some that turned out true, and this fact should not be lost sight of. Owing to the smallness of the Ottawa local force and other circumstances, it was thought proper to submit this item. When the force contemplated was not elsewhere employed, it might be engaged in watching the public buildings and other property.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD hoped there would be no vote for secret service placed in the supplementary estimates this year.

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

After some further discussion the item was carried.

On the item of \$10,000 for the Montreal Water Police,

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN reiterated the hope that he had expressed every session since he came here—that this department would be handed over to the Local Government.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was an actual revenue from the Water Police which more than paid for the maintenance of the force. They were employed to aid in collection of tonnage dues at Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. WORKMAN said that the Water Police of Montreal were an excellent and useful body of men and were of great importance to the trade of the city.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said his only objection was that this Government should deal with a matter which was under the control of the Local authorities.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL said so long as the expense of the force was covered by the revenue they brought in, there could be no doubt that it would be well to maintain them.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought this was but an incident of the control which Government had over trade and navigation.

After some further discussion the item was passed.

Item of \$10,438, for Quebec Water Police, was also passed.

The Committee then rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER proposed that the estimates should be proceeded with on the following day, after the usual private business.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON agreed to this being done, provided they were not kept till a late hour.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The House went into Committee to consider certain resolutions for the establishing of a uniform system of Weights and Measures for all Canada, which resolutions were passed.

INSPECTION LAWS.

The House went into Committee to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to amend and consolidate and to extend to the whole Dominion of Canada the laws respecting the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce—Carried.

The Committee rose, and the House adjourned at 11:15 p. m.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN gave notice of a series of enquiries connected with the admission of British Columbia into the Union.

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented a petition from traders in Montreal concerning raw hides.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS laid on the table certain papers respecting the withdrawal of troops from the Provinces.

THE GEOLOGICAL REPORT.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked if the Government could give the House some information respecting Literary Societies to whom the Geological Report had been sent, as he wished to know if the numerous associations in the Maritime Provinces would receive any.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS replied that a certain number of copies had been sent to the Local Governments for distribution among Literary Associations.

SALARIES OF THE LIEUT. GOVERNORS.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that it was now pretty generally admitted that in fixing the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors of the various Provinces, at the commencement of Confederation, a great mistake had been made, and that the amounts were altogether inadequate to the dignity and responsibility of the position. That was felt still more by comparing with those salaries the large amount given to the Governor General of the Dominion, who had to live in a remote city of Canada. Neither was it fair that there should be a distinction between the smaller and larger Provinces. A Lieutenant Governor in Nova Scotia occupied a position involving more expense and responsibility, in some respects, than were entailed upon the same functionaries elsewhere, inasmuch as Halifax was the headquarters of the army and navy, and was frequently visited by foreign men of war, which, in the latter case, necessitated international as well as local courtesies and hospitality. Therefore any gentleman holding the position must feel that the expense to which he was necessarily put in properly sustaining his dignity, was much beyond that of any other Lieutenant Governor of the Dominion. He was of the opinion that the salaries of all those officers had been fixed at too low a rate, and it was not consistent with the dignity of the several provinces, nor was

it just to those personally concerned, that gentlemen occupying the chief executive position should be obliged to draw upon their own private means as some of them were now obliged to do—as the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia must certainly be forced to do at the present time. He did not make those remarks with the view of finding fault with the Government, for he had no doubt that the motive which actuated them in fixing the salaries was one of economy; but still he was convinced that since the system of union was working so satisfactorily and there was already a large surplus revenue, we were at length in a condition to do justice to these important public functionaries. With these remarks, he asked whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps during the present Session to equalize the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors of the several Provinces of the Dominion by increasing the salaries of those officers in *Nova Scotia* and *New Brunswick*?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that he did not think it would at all tend to the convenience or despatch of the public business, that the House should enter into lengthy discussions on mere enquiries. He did not mean to say that his hon. friend had departed from the rule which was read from May yesterday by the hon. speaker, but at the same time, he thought it was very desirable that hon. gentlemen should confine themselves as closely as possible to the subject matter of the enquiry. As respects the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors they had been fixed under the impression that they would be quite adequate to the position after Confederation. It was thought that a Lieutenant Governor in Ontario and Quebec would be subject to larger expense than in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where the population was not so great, and the capitals were not so large. There was much force in the remarks of his hon. friend respecting the Lieutenant Governor in Nova Scotia, who was necessarily subject to larger expense than he would be at a place like Fredericton, which was not the headquarters for the army and navy. His hon. friend might be right in saying that the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors were inadequate, but he presumed that they were thought to be sufficient at the time they were fixed, inasmuch as those officers would not exactly occupy the position the same functionaries did previous to Confederation. Perhaps, in the desire to be economical, there was not a sufficient comprehension of the expense to which those officers would be called upon to meet. Without going further into the subject, he

would reply to the question of the hon. gentleman, by stating that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce during the present session any measure for the equalization of the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors of the several Provinces of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said, in addition to what had been already stated, it might be mentioned that Halifax was the port of call for steamers connecting between Europe and the United States, and in that way there was some additional responsibility and expense thrown upon the gentleman who now occupied the high position in Nova Scotia. His hon. friend (Sir E. Kenny), who so worthily of late filled the position (cheers), would perhaps be able to corroborate his remarks in this particular. Whilst he entirely concurred in the strict liberal, correctness of the rule which the hon. Postmaster General had laid down, yet he might be allowed to say that he did not observe that the rule in respect to the lowering of the salaries had been enforced in any other dependencies of the Empire.

THE CENSUS.

In pursuance with the order of the day, The Bill to amend the Census Act was read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON presented the fifth report of the Joint Committee on Printing in reference to the printing of certain public documents.

Ordered that the report be taken into consideration on Monday next.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN expressed the hope that the resolutions relative to the admission of British Columbia into the Confederation would be introduced into the Senate simultaneously with the resolutions in the House of Commons. It was not agreeable to gentlemen to be obliged to discuss such questions when they had been worn thread bare in another place.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the resolutions would have to originate in Committee of the Whole, in the House of Commons, for they involved a charge on the revenue, and therefore the question would be first taken up in the other branch. He was, however, very desirous of meeting the views of the Senate, and would consider the question.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that the British North America Act, providing for the union

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

of the Provinces, had been first introduced in the House of Lords, with those portions referring to taxation in brackets. He did not see why a similar course could not be pursued in the present case.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the Bill in question did not involve taxation on the people of England.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN contended that the Senate had a right to take up the question of the policy of admitting British Columbia, and discuss it at full length.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL again said he was anxious to meet the wishes of the House—all that he desired was to proceed in conformity with constitutional usage.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that a Bill providing for a change in the Post Office Department, came first before that House, and he did not see why the Senate should be denied the same privilege now, unless indeed it was to be denuded of a great share of its proper responsibility.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he did not wish to see the House place itself in the undignified position of taking up a measure which it could not carry out. The Senate might decide it was wise to annex British Columbia, and subsequently find that a resolution had been passed in the House of Commons, refusing to charge the public revenues with the necessary amount of money. His own experience, certainly, respecting the Post Office Act was not such as to induce him to repeat it. He must add that he yielded to no one in the earnest desire to do everything possible to promote the usefulness of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that the resolutions providing for Union were first introduced in the Legislative Council of Canada in 1867 by the late Sir E. Tache, and he thought it was equally allowable to follow the same course now.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL was not quite sure that the resolutions introduced in the Council were identical with those taken up in the Legislative Assembly, but in any case they involved an address to the Queen asking for a new constitution. The proposed resolutions involved a charge on the public revenues of Canada herself.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN was understood to suggest that the House might go into Committee on the Message of His Excellency relative to the union, recently submitted to the House, and then a resolution might be moved in due form.

THE CANAL COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked the Govern-

ment if the report of the Canal Commissioners was ready to be submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government had received a report of the majority of the Commissioners, also a report of a single member dissenting from the others. The first had been printed, and would be submitted with the other in manuscript.

BILL.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT introduced a Bill to extend the provisions of the Act of the late Province of Canada, respecting the Synod of the Church of England, to New Brunswick.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1871.

The House opened at three o'clock.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON moved for leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Dominion Telegraph Company.—Carried.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. CURRIER asked whether it is the intention of the Government to allow the British American Bank Note Company to remove their establishment from the seat of Government to Montreal.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the Government entered into a contract with the company nearly four years ago, one of the conditions of which was that its operations should be carried on in Ottawa. The contract was for four years, and it was understood the company were to have the whole business of the bank note engraving for the Dominion, it being then contemplated that the Government would have the whole of that engraving in their own hands. However the circumstances had altered, the Government were only one and by no means the largest of the customers of that Company. They made strong representations to the Government that Montreal was the most convenient place for their business; and it became a question whether the Government would, for the sake of the few months that the contract had to run, place obstructions in the company's way. By February next, when it ran out, the Government could decide whether they would again give the company their business. But they could not fairly control it as to the place it should conduct its business in irrespective of its own interest and convenience. At the best the Government could prevent it

but for a few months from removing to Montreal.

Mr. KEELER asked, has the Government received the report of the Canal Commissioners, and if so, when will it be laid before the House?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied that the report had not yet been received.

Mr. KEELER asked, whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates for dredging the entrance to Presque Isle harbour?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied that the matter was under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. KEELER asked, whether it is the intention of the Government to make any arrangement for the observance of the first day of July as a general holiday for the Dominion?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the usual practice followed with regard to Dominion Day would be followed up next Dominion Day [laughter].

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT called the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to the fact that the return asked for some time ago, with respect to the defence of the country, had not yet been brought down.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that returns on the same subject had been asked for in the Senate last year. These returns would be presented in that Chamber to-morrow. The returns asked for in this House during the present session would be brought down at the earliest moment possible, and the two returns would be printed together.

Mr. PELLETIER moved for a return of correspondence relating to the establishment of Boards of Examiners for granting certificates to masters or mates of sea-going ships, &c.—Carried.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved for an Order of the House showing the rate of interest paid by the different savings banks in the Province of Quebec. He explained that his object was to include only those banks which would be affected by the new savings banks measure of the Finance Minister.

At the suggestion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the motion was amended by adding the words, "And the Province of Ontario."

The motion as amended was carried.

Mr. CURRIER moved for correspondence respecting claims for damages against the Government by George Sterling.—Carried.

Mr. PICKARD moved for an address for a return of the monies received on account of private bills. He said his object was to

ascertain the number and character of those bills in respect of which the monies had been returned on the ground of their being treated as public bills.—Carried.

Mr. BROUSSEAU moved the adoption of the fourth report of the Joint Committee on Printing.—Carried.

Mr. BROUSSEAU also moved the adoption of the Committee's fifth report. He explained it contained a recommendation of the transfer of the binding contract from Hunter, Rose & Co. to Mr. Mortimer, at their request, and to enable them to remove their establishment to Toronto. Mr. Mortimer had furnished satisfactory securities.—Carried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved for a return showing the land taken for railway purposes on sections 4 and 11 of the Intercolonial Railway, &c.

The motion was carried with a slight amendment.

Mr. MILLS moved for a statement of the quantity and value of the various kinds of articles imported into British Columbia for the last fiscal year, of which there are available returns showing the duties collected, and the amount which would have been collected had the Canadian tariff been in operation.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the papers would be procured as speedily as possible. There would doubtless be some delay to enable the comparison to be made and surmount other difficulties.

Mr. BURPEE moved for an address for a return shewing the quantity of coal, coke, wheat, corn and other grain, wheat and rye, flour, and meal, imported into each of the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick respectively from the 7th April to the 31st December, 1870, the amount of duty collected on such articles respectively in each Province; also the quantity of such articles on which duties were paid or received which were afterwards shipped from each of the said Provinces either in bond or subject to a drawback of such duties, also the quantity of such articles being the produce of any one of the Provinces which was shipped therefrom to each of the other said Provinces between the dates above mentioned.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the Government would furnish the information so far as in their power. It was utterly impossible to give the quantity of grain moved from Ontario to Quebec, or even from the ports of Quebec to those of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. For the first year after the union the system that existed previous thereto, with regard to the returns affecting the trade between the Eastern

and Western Provinces, continued, that is, parties clearing were required to clear their exports at those Provinces, and enter them in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The Government continued that system for a time, to ascertain, if possible, the extent of the increase of the interprovincial trade growing out of Confederation. But it was found to interfere so much with the general trade between the Provinces that dissatisfaction early arose. Articles appeared in the Montreal, and other papers, condemning the inconvenience to which parties were subjected importing from the Lower Provinces. The Government then abandoned the system, and adopted the next best, to keep a record of the trade between the Provinces. They could not give the statement asked, not having any such record. By that in force, the information which might be the most important, as to the quantity of the flour, grain, coal, &c., imported and the duty paid, the imports and exports would be furnished as far as possible.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he would suppose that all the water borne produce to the Lower Provinces, would be reported even from the Upper Provinces of the Dominion. The Department must be in a position to show the total amount of produce imported into the Lower Provinces from the Upper ones by water, and the whole course of the trade was by water.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said it was not by water altogether. One of the objects of original regulations was that a vessel coming from any of the Maritime ports to Quebec or Montreal, should enter at the Custom House a statement of the articles shipped. That requirement had been abandoned, and now it was only necessary that in the case of a vessel clearing from Montreal, say for Shediac, Halifax, or other lower ports, the captain should leave with the Collector at Montreal, or the port of departure, a statement of his cargo, and also at the place of arrival. Even as between Quebec and Ontario, a deposit of papers was required; but in the returns made to the Department, they had not called for all these papers.

Mr. BURPEE said his object was to obtain the papers showing the trade between the several Provinces, and to ascertain its volume and progress since the Union.—Motion carried.

THE NORTH WEST.

Dr. BOWN desired to put a question before the orders of the day were called, if the Government had no objection.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER consented.

Mr. Pickard.

Dr. BOWN said that judging from private advices just received from Manitoba, the people were in a great state of excitement, from the belief that the Dominion Government had given Lieutenant Governor Archibald private instructions of a nature offensive or hostile to the feelings of the loyal people of the Province. Therefore, if the impression were false, he hoped an emphatic denial would be given the story.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government were ready with their reply. Neither they nor any of their number had given any private or confidential instructions to the Lieutenant Governor. The instructions given him in his two-fold capacity as Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba and Governor of the North West, had been brought before the House in reply to an address. No other instructions, private or public, had been furnished.

Hon. Mr. DORION wished, before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, to call attention to the state of the public mind, which had been disturbed for the last two days by reports of trouble in Manitoba. He thought it would be well for the Government, if they had any information on the subject, to give it, and allay the anxiety caused by the news.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was glad that the question had been put. The last information that Government had received from Manitoba was on the night of the 14th. It was a telegram from Governor Archibald, informing the Government that the Writs and papers necessary for holding the elections had been found, and that a proclamation had been issued to hold the elections, but no information whatever had been received corroborating any of those newspaper reports (a laugh). The telegram came from St. Cloud, and was dated March 14. The sensational news came from Chicago, and he noticed that further news from St. Paul, while it spoke of great excitement existing in Manitoba, did not confirm the first reports.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL was sure that the House would be pleased to receive this information. Perhaps while the Hon. Minister of Militia was in so good humor for answering questions he would inform the House whether the proposed confirmation of the Manitoba Bill had made any progress.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER was glad, too, that question had been asked. (Laughter.) The draft of the Bill had been approved by the Governor in Council, and had been transmitted under cover of a despatch from His Excellency to England to be submitted to the Im-

perial Government. At some future time this matter could be discussed more fully. The Government of the Dominion had asked the Imperial authorities to pass an act in confirmation of the wishes of this House as expressed last session. (Cries of "No, no," from the Opposition.) Nothing could be more certain than the passage of that Act.

The subject was dropped.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked whether the Government had any information with regard to a statement made in a Montreal daily paper, to the effect that Lt. Governor Archibald had issued a regimental order to the soldiers to salute the clergy.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said Mr. Archibald was only a Civil Governor, and had no authority in military matters, the troops in Manitoba being entirely under the command of Lieut.-Col. Jarvis.

Mr. CAMERON then asked whether Mr. Archibald had induced the officer in command of the troops to issue such an order.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was sure that Mr. Archibald knew his duty too well, to interfere in any way with what appertained solely to the officer in command of the troops.

HARBOUR DUES AT TRENTON.

Mr. BROWN moved the third reading of a Bill to authorise the village of Trenton to impose and collect harbour dues.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER asked the hon. gentleman to allow the Bill to stand over till Monday, as he would like to consider the matter.

Third reading accordingly postponed.

HARBOUR DUES AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. SNIDER moved the third reading of a Bill extending the provisions of the Act authorizing the imposition and collection of harbour dues at Owen Sound.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER asked that this Bill also might be postponed till Monday.

Mr. SNIDER consented to the postponement, but pointed out that two similar Bills had passed in the previous session when the Minister of Justice was in his place, and that there was no doubt that the House had power to deal with such questions.

The third reading was accordingly postponed.

RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. MACFARLANE (Perth) moved the second reading of a Bill to amend the Railway Act of 1868. He explained that

as the law at present stood, Railway Companies were enabled to place on the backs of their Shipping Bills, conditions of a most unreasonable character, which, in point of fact exempted them from all liability from any damages, although such damages might be occasioned by the most gross negligence on the part of their servants. He desired therefore to amend the law, so that although the Companies might make their own conditions, those conditions should not be enforced unless just and reasonable, and he thought the Courts were the proper judges as to what was just and reasonable. He desired to extend his amendment to all Railways, including those already in operation. His Bill was merely a transcript of an Act already in force in England. No matter how gross the neglect or misconduct might be, the Companies relied on their conditions, and the Courts had to consider those conditions as forming a special contract, and exempting the Companies from all liability, but on more than one occasion, the judges had expressed their opinion that the law ought to be altered. He referred to one condition made by Railway Companies; that no claims for damages would be entertained unless notice should be given within 24 hours, pointing out the impossibility of a compliance with this condition in very many cases. He thought it very necessary indeed that such conditions should not be allowed.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON (Toronto West) was entirely in favour of the Bill. Some of the conditions imposed by Railway Companies were simply monstrous. One condition provided that the Company should not be liable for the negligence either civil or criminal of itself or its servants, and it was very fortunate that they did not provide that they should not be sued for anything whatever. This condition, though so outrageous, was insisted on, and as the law stood, the courts had to maintain it. The result was, the servants of the company were much less careful than they otherwise would be. It had been urged that the question was a mere matter of contract, and that if parties accepted the conditions they must be bound by them. But Railways were not only common carriers, but had a monopoly of the carrying trade, especially during the winter. All that was proposed was that the conditions should be reasonable. At present the conditions were so iniquitous, that jurors were actually prejudiced against Railways whenever a case came before them. The proposition was, that the Courts should decide as to whether the conditions were reasonable. The same difficulties that now existed in Canada, had been experienced in England some years

before, and a law had been passed to remedy the evil. That law had worked satisfactorily and well, and the hon. member for Perth simply desired to enact a similar law in Canada. He very cordially supported the Bill.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON (Peel) pointed out that there were before the House two other Bills, also proposing to amend the Railway Act of 1868, and suggested that all these should be referred to a special committee. There was no doubt that very great difficulty had arisen from the nature of the conditions drawn up by Railway Companies. This difficulty had been felt both in England and the United States, where legislation had been had to remedy the evil, and it was very desirable that action should be taken in Canada also.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER thought it would be very desirable to consider the three Bills together, but thought they should be referred not to any special committee, but to the ordinary Railway Committee, as the matter was a large one, affecting the whole Railway Legislation, with which the Railway Committee were especially conversant. He would therefore recommend that the three Bills should be read a second time and referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) thought, without any disrespect to the Railway Committee, that a Special Committee would do most justice to the matter. He was satisfied that the law required to be amended; as it now stood, he would defy anyone to sustain an action against a railway company. He thought the whole railway legislation of the country required to be revised.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON (Peel) said that the reason why he desired the matter referred to a Special Committee was, that he was anxious to be able to look after his own Bill. He thought, however, that the matter might be referred to a Special Committee in the first instance, and afterwards taken up by the Ordinary Committee,—still if the Minister of Militia would say that the matter should be taken up at once, he would be satisfied.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there would be no difficulty in that respect, and as the recommendations of the Railway Committee always had great weight with the House, and were seldom questioned, he thought it very desirable that that Committee should deal with the matter. The rules of the House required that this should be done.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK (Frontenac) said he entirely agreed with the hon. member for Peel, that the Bills should, in the first instance, be referred to a Special Commit-

Mr. Macfarlane.

tee. The matter was of great importance. Judges had expressed their disapprobation of the present state of the law, and their opinion that the Legislature should amend it. It had been stated that the matter should not be interfered with, because it was a simple contract between two parties—but it must be remembered that the House gave the Companies special privileges, and protected them from undue competition, and they should, at the same time, therefore, protect the interests of the public, and prevent the Companies who monopolised the carrying trade from imposing unreasonable and unjust conditions.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought with the Hon. Minister of Militia, that the Railway Committee was the proper body to deal with the question—and further as that Committee included lawyers from all the Provinces, who could see how the proposed amendments would agree with the existing laws in their respective Provinces, it had a great advantage over the proposed Special Committee in which Ontario alone was to be represented. There was nothing to prevent the Committee from at once dealing with the matter.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON had no objection to the matter being left to the Ordinary Committee, provided it would undertake to deal with it.

Mr. MACFARLANE'S Bill, Hon. Mr. CAMERON'S Bill, and Mr. KIRKPATRICK'S Bill were then read a second time and referred to the Railway Committee.

RIGHT OF APPEAL IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON (Toronto West) moved the second reading of "An Act to extend the right of appeal in criminal cases." His object was to provide that there should be the same right of appeal for a new trial in criminal cases as there was in civil cases. At present a Judge could reserve a point of law for consideration in civil cases, but though there might be a mistaken verdict in criminal cases from a wrong interpretation of facts, or the discovery of new evidence, there was no power to grant a new trial. Of course, if a man, after being declared guilty, was found to be innocent the Government could pardon him, but to pardon an innocent man was simply an insult. He ought to have the right to prove his innocence and be declared so.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTER hoped the motion would not be pressed. The Premier did not approve of the Ontario appeal system, which, in the Bill for the consolidation of the criminal laws of the Provinces, was not embodied. It had worked

ill; if a change of opinion in its favour took place, the present proposal could be re-introduced.

Hon. Col. GRAY thought that, however plausible the present proposition might be, he doubted whether it would be beneficial to the criminal law or to the public. The actual point now to considered was, whether there should be a new trial on the question of the facts or on the question of the merits. By this Bill the accused would lose some valuable advantages. Not only did the accused lose the advantage of the usual recommendation in his behalf, that he should receive the benefit of the doubt, but the public would suffer from a change that would be tantamount to a premium to crime. The facility of obtaining a new trial would be of this nature, especially in the case of ignorant and degraded characters. The moment the accused was granted the privilege of obtaining a new trial, for reasons prescribed in the Bill, that moment he would lose several precious advantages. No doubts would be given in his favour, and he could not afterwards have the benefit of witnesses. If these changes were adopted all the sources of information should be laid under appeal, even to the examination of the criminal himself. Till it should be shown the present law worked badly, the innovations now submitted ought not to be adopted. He thought so far no such pretension could be sustained.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON spoke against the bill, and contended it should not be urged forward at present in the absence of the Minister of Justice. He hoped that when he returned, and the matter was discussed in this House, various improvements would be presented, and that the same privileges possessed by parties in civil cases with regard to the vindication of their character and protection of other interests, would be extended to parties charged with crime.

Mr. HARRISON replied to the arguments of the foregoing speakers, and concluded by expressing his willingness to withdraw the Bill for the present.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the second reading of Bill No. 12—An Act to amend an Act, passed in the 31st year of Her Majesty's reign, and chaptered sixty-six, respecting aliens and naturalization. He said it was advisable that a foreigner settling in this country, should be allowed the rights of citizenship with the least possible ceremony. The Legislatures of other countries had liberal laws with respect to naturalization. This measure now before the House proposed to confer the right of citizenship on all persons residing in the country previous to Confed-

eration, on taking the oath of allegiance. This would apply to a large number of persons in the county of Huron, at least, if not in other parts of the country. The present law was cumbrous and totally unsuited to the requirements of the country.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said while he approved of the Bill as a whole, it contained provisions which were objectionable. He would not, however, refer to them until the Bill was referred to Committee. When in London, the Colonial Secretary referred to this subject, and said there would be no objection to endorsing any legislation on the part of the Dominion Parliament with regard to naturalization. But that care should be taken in dealing with foreigners who were connected with seafaring pursuits. It was, therefore, necessary in the enactment of naturalization laws to exercise great prudence, lest the Acts of this House should be disallowed. He would recommend that the Bill be referred to a special Committee with Mr. Young's measure on the same subject. The two could be considered at the same time, and as Mr. Young was expected back in a few days, no great delay would result from the adoption of this suggestion.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) said this proposal was evidently with the object of killing the Bill altogether. He had no objection to placing Mr. Young's name on the Committee, but that gentleman was not here.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER denied any such intention as imputed.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON argued they ought to continue a previous existing liberal policy for the encouragement of immigration. He thought every encouragement should be given this Bill, the defects of which could be remedied in Committee.

The motion was carried, and the Bill was referred to a special committee.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. CAMERON moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved the second reading of a Bill respecting the naturalization of certain aliens, and that it be referred to a Select Committee.—Carried.

Mr. HARRISON moved the second reading of the Bill to extend the law as to the carrying of dangerous weapons. He explained its object was to prevent the carrying of pistols, which constituted a great temptation to violence and a great damage to life.—Carried

Mr. DREW, on the motion for the second reading of his Bill, "An Act respecting County Court Judges in the

Mr. Cameron.

Province of Ontario," declaring their remuneration for the discharge of Judicial duties, considered that County Court Judges were purely Judges, and that they should receive a fixed salary, and in no way depend on fees—and trusting the Government would consider the question, asked leave to withdraw his Bill.

Mr. HARRISON thought that the salaries of these Judges should be increased.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) said the Government could hardly expect to get any but fifth or sixth rate lawyers to act as judges at a salary of \$2,000 a year. He trusted that Government would increase the salaries of these Judges.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said that while \$1,600 for an Accountant's salary was considered a pretty high rate, members of the bar were always complaining of the low salaries paid to Judges. He supposed that it was because hon. members looked forward to obtaining positions on the bench at some future day. (Hear, hear.)

The Bill was withdrawn.

Mr. GODIN, in the absence of Mr. Savary, moved the second reading of Bill No. 20, to amend section 2 of the Insolvent Act of 1869, and also the second reading of Bill No. 35, having a similar object. He proposed to refer the Bills to a Special Committee.

Bill No. 20 had but one section, which was as follows:—"In cases of voluntary assignment, the meeting of the creditors to be called for the appointment of an Assignee, may be held at the place of business of the Insolvent as heretofore provided in and by said section, or at the office of the Interim Assignee, as the Interim Assignee calling the same may deem most expedient in each case."

Bill No. 35 contained the following provisions:—

1. In all cases in which, either under the fifth or under the twenty eighth section of the said Act, an Assignee to the estate of the Insolvent shall be appointed, the Interim Assignee shall not be compelled to transfer the estate and effects of the Insolvent, nor to deliver over such estate to such Assignee, until all fees, expenses, and disbursements of the Interim Assignee or Guardian, as taxed by the Judge, Prothonotary, or Clerk of the Court, shall have been paid to him, and the delay of twenty-four hours mentioned in the eighth section of the said Act shall not be held to commence until after such payment and reimbursements shall have been made

2. All oaths to be administered under the said Act, for any other purpose whatsoever,

may be administered by the Prothonotary or Clerk of the Court in like manner as by the Judge.

He desired to authorise the Interim Assignee to hold the estate until he had received payment of his fees, as taxed by the Judge of the Court. He did not desire to insist on the particular provisions of his Bill, but wished to have it referred to a Special Committee, so that in some way the difficulty the Interim Assignee experienced in obtaining his fees, might be obviated. He also thought it advisable that either the Judge or the Clerk of the Court should have authority to administer the oaths.

Mr. SCATCHERD submitted that it would be a very great hardship to the creditors, if they were compelled to pay any fees the Interim Assignee might choose to demand before the handing over of the estate. The position of the Assignee was a very lucrative one, and much sought after, and he certainly thought the interests of the creditors should be considered.

Mr. BARTHE thought the provisions of the Bill were very much wanted, for while the assignee had very important duties to perform, he very often had great difficulty in obtaining payment of his charges.

Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT thought the opinions of the gentleman who had just spoken were entitled to great weight, but was very doubtful as to the merits of the Bill. It proposed that the fees of the Interim Assignee should be paid before he handed over the estate, but at that time there was no fund out of which those fees could be paid. The effect would be to offer a premium to the Interim Assignee to make out as large a bill as he possibly could, in the hope that rather than wait for the estate, the creditors would raise the money to pay him. He thought any such provision would be a very grave misfortune as estates were already quite sufficiently depleted. He was in favour, however, of the most stringent possible mode of enforcing the payment of the Interim Assignee, out of the first proceeds realised. The object of Bill No. 20 seemed to be, that the first meeting of creditors might be held in the office of the Interim Assignee. The point was not of very great importance, but it should be remembered that on the passing of the Insolvent Act of 1869, it was considered of sufficient importance by the different Boards of Trade, to justify them in making a special representation, that it would be injurious to a proper choice of an official assignee to have the meeting held in the office of the Interim Assignee. He was, however, in favour of the Bills going before the Committee in order that they might be considered, and some-

thing done that would remove the evils now existing.

Hon. Col. GRAY said, at a meeting of the St. John Chamber of Commerce recently, the opinion was expressed that the first clause of the Act should be extended, to embrace all persons, traders or others whose debts were not outlawed by the statute of limitations. This was for the purpose of meeting the cases of persons who were not in business at the time of the passage of the Act, and who consequently could not take advantage of its provisions. The Chamber also recommended that the meeting of creditors should be held at the office of the Interim Assignee, only in cases where the debtor had no place of business. He (Col. Gray) hoped the Special Committee would consider these suggestions when dealing with these bills.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that these resolutions were adopted by the St. John Chamber of Commerce to meet special cases and serve private ends.

The two Bills were read a second time and referred to a Special Committee.

Mr. HARRISON moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 29)—An Act to remove doubts as to the liability to stamp duties of premium notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies. He said in making this motion he did so with the entire confidence of the Government, to whom he had submitted his measure.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explanation from the Government with respect to this Bill.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said his attention had been called to this matter, and he was quite convinced of the necessity of the Bill in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said this was a measure of which the Government should take the entire responsibility. It related to the public revenue, and could not be proceeded with, unless the formal assent of the Crown should be first obtained. It affected the revenue derivable from stamps, and therefore came within the meaning of the 54th clause of the Union Act.

Mr. HARRISON contended that as the Bill asked for no appropriation of the public money it did not come under the clause referred to.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was of opinion that the point of order was not well raised.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought he had taken his exception well. But whatever was true as to this matter, there was no doubt that the measure should have originated in Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS stated in reply to some remarks of the member for Chateauguay, that he had not been in order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON replied, the hon. gentleman was frequently out of order, and consequently had often to withdraw measures till another stage.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS repeated the hon. gentleman was not in order. Doubtless, he did understand such matters better than he (Sir F. Hincks). Thank God, he had not devoted his mind or his life to the notions of the hon. gentleman. He had not passed his time studying these trivial subjects. If he had applied his mind to them, he would have understood them as well now as that hon. member. It was the only thing he devoted his mind to (cheers and laughter)

Hon. Mr. HOLTON rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman was not speaking to the point of order (renewed cheers and laughter).

The SPEAKER said he did not conceive the fifty first section applied to the Bill before the House. The appropriations which required a message in the first instance, in order to give this House power to deal with the subject, were related to a power to appropriate or spend money. The imposition of taxation was a power within the control of the House, which could impose it without a preliminary message, but it must inaugurate its measure by a Committee of the whole.

After some further discussion,

Hon. Mr. MORRIS stated a message was received from His Excellency authorising the consideration of this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought his views were in accordance with the practice of the House. He defended the usefulness of Parliamentary rules, and referred to the value of Parliamentary forms in the past as defences and safeguards of freedom. He had used these creations in the interest of the public, and as the natural and proper weapons of the Opposition confronted by a powerful Government. If they accepted the responsibility for this Bill, he would not insist on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he was willing to take charge of the Bill with the consent of the member for West Toronto.

The SPEAKER said the point of order should not be slurred over or disposed of by mutual concession. The question involved was one of importance. It would be necessary for the House to discharge the order, before the Minister of Inland Revenue could take it up.

Mr. HARRISON then proceeded to speak upon the point of order as to

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

whether the Bill imposed a tax. He quite admitted that any proposition to impose taxation should originate in a Committee of the Whole. This Bill, however, did not make this proposal. The question was whether the Bill really did impose a new charge on the people. It did not; it allowed parties to impose duties on themselves, but it did not in any shape or form provide that the promissory notes should be subject to double duty. In ordinary cases of imposition of duty, the duty was compulsory, but where it was left to the discretion of the people to say whether or not, to gain a particular advantage, they would assume a burden, that burden was entirely optional.

The SPEAKER said he considered that there was nothing optional in the case as regards the past.

Mr. HARRISON thought there was as much choice in the past as in the future. In neither case was the double duty imposed by the Legislature, but the offer was given to the people, if they wished to make their notes valid, to do it on paying double duty. In the next place the matter could in no way be considered an imposition of duty on the "people," because it only affected a certain class of the people. He cited authorities in support of his views.

Mr. MAGILL and Mr. MILLS spoke on the subject in opposition to the arguments of the mover of the Bill.

Hon. Col. GRAY supported the hon. mover's views, and he having replied, the point of order was taken into consideration.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the adjournment of the debate—Carried.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the reception of the report of Committee of the Whole on the following resolution:—

1. That it is expedient to amend and consolidate the laws of the Dominion respecting Weights and Measures, and to establish one uniform system thereof for all Canada, except only as to special measures used for certain purposes in the Province of Quebec; and to provide for the inspection of Weights and Measures, with power to the Governor in Council to make a tariff of fees for such inspection sufficient to defray the expenses of carrying it into effect.

The motion was carried, and a Bill founded on the resolutions read a first time.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the reception of the report of the Committee on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to permit the use of the metric system of Weights and Measures in the Dominion, in cases where the parties to any contract or agreement may wish to adopt that system.

The motion was carried, and a Bill founded upon the resolution was read a first time.

INSPECTION LAWS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the resolution declaring it expedient to amend and consolidate and to extend to the whole Dominion of Canada the laws respecting the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce.

Motion carried and Bill introduced.

On motion of Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER the House adjourned at ten o'clock.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

THE CURRENCY.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN (who was only imperfectly heard) gave notice of certain enquiries respecting the currency, and wished particularly to know if it was really the intention of the Government during the present session to carry the measure which they had introduced in the House of Commons. When the country saw a measure postponed day after day at the request of a small minority, it was time to ask the Government if they were sincere. It was only necessary to present a petition from some Halifax bankers to force the Government to hesitate on a matter of public policy on which they should by this time have made up their minds.

Hon. Mr. MILLER did not wish to call the hon. member to order, but it was not fair of that hon. gentleman to take advantage of such an occasion to make reflections upon Nova Scotia and her representatives in that House, and elsewhere. No doubt the hon. gentleman felt the want this Session of that inspiration which he had formerly in the presence of an hon. gentleman who was not now on those Benches. Now that the Government had taken up the question of the currency he believed that the majority of the representatives from Nova Scotia—he could certainly speak for himself—were willing to submit to some temporary inconvenience in view of the general interests of the

Dominion. The hon. member desired to know who was to bear the expense incurred on account of Nova Scotia notes having been accepted at St. John as legal tender for Customs duties. That arrangement was purely in the interests of the trade and commerce of St. John, and under those circumstances it was clearly the duty of the Government to charge the Province of New Brunswick with any loss that might have arisen. (Laughter.) If the hon. member desired to discuss any Nova Scotia question with the members from that Province, he should pursue the proper course, and they would gladly meet him.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT suggested if the hon. member should not add to his notice, some reference to the cost of removing the silver nuisance.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN disclaimed any intention of attacking Nova Scotia. It was known that she had already succeeded for some time in deferring the measure of the assimilation of the currency, and he wished now to find whether her representatives were to be equally successful this session.

MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON enquired if the Government had received any corroboration of the rumours respecting troubles having broken out in the new Province of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—We have news from Manitoba this morning, from Winnipeg to the first and from St. Cloud to the 16th instant, concerning the elections now in progress; but not a word is said about any disturbances having taken place at Winnipeg [cheers].

MESSAGE.

A message was received from the House of Commons, informing the Senate that they had adopted amendments to census Bill and passed an Act providing for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of the revenue. The latter Bill ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.

The House then adjourned:

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 17th, 1871.

The House met at three o'clock.

A number of reports of Committees were presented.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK—To incorporate the Kingston Board of Trade:

By Mr. CRAWFORD [Leeds]—To naturalise Polaski Clarke.

By Mr. COLBY—For the repeal of the Insolvency laws.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved that on Tuesday next, the House be resolved into Committee of the Whole, to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to sell, on such terms as may seem fit, Oakville Harbour with the tolls and all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining. He stated, in making this motion, that he did so with the assent of His Excellency and in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON stated it would be remembered that the Public Accounts Committee last year, adopted a resolution, desiring the Government to take the earliest opportunity of collecting the arrears due on this work. He would like to know what Government had done in the matter.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the Government had considered the matter with the view of selling the harbour, which was the only way of recovering the arrears due. The charter was granted 43 or 44 years ago for the term of 50 years, at the end of which time the harbour was to lapse to the Government. It was found on enquiry, it would be difficult to sell the rights in this harbour for the limited period of the deed or charter, without the power now asked for. The object of the Bill was to enable the Government to sell out their rights and give a good title at the end of the 50 years.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked was it intended to remit any portion of the arrears. He believed the parties were able to pay up.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—No; the object was only to give the purchaser a good title.

Mr. WHYTE was glad that the Government had taken this course, as the harbour of Oakville had fallen out of repair. He trusted the Government would be induced not to levy any longer the excessive tolls which had been collected from that work.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD hoped the Government would have nothing to do with the work.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that he understood that by the Confederation Act, only those harbours which were public works and belonged to the Province before Confederation, became the property of the Dominion. The Government had of course power to construct harbours wherever they thought such works were required, but he did not understand that they were required to repair private harbours.

Mr Crawford.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS repeated his explanations respecting the motion before the House.

The motion after some further conversation was carried.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to amend the Act respecting Insurance Companies. He said the assent of the Governor General had been secured.—Carried.

NORTH WEST.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said the Government had received a telegram, dated St Cloud, yesterday, which contained information from Winnipeg up to 1st March. The nominations for the House of Commons were held on the 28th February, during a snow storm. They passed off quietly. The elections were to come off on the 3rd of March. The Local House was to meet on the 15th March. They had no intimation of any insurrection having taken place, or any unusual excitement.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of supply.

A number of the items under the head Administration of Justice having passed,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said when the House was in Committee of supply, some discussion arose on the item respecting the person charged with the murder of the late Hon. T. D. McGee. He (Mr. Holton) did not propose renewing the discussion on that item in any respect, but he took this occasion of inquiring of the Government, whether any thing had been done by them to keep faith with those parties who were stimulated by the offer of a reward from the Government, to ferret out and arrest the perpetrator or perpetrators of that horrible deed. He did not find in the Public Accounts any statement of any payment whatever of the reward offered by the Government. Perhaps the Government would be prepared to say whether any payment had been made, or whether any claim now pending was well founded.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER said he understood that the Government had kept faith in the matter, but he would make further enquiries concerning it.

In answer to Mr. CURRIER,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there

were several claims before the Minister of Justice.

After some further discussion the subject was dropped, and the resolution was concurred in down to, and including, the item for the River Police of Quebec.

RETURN OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS submitted a return of the Companies that have made deposits. Forty-two complied, and five did not.

UNIFORM CURRENCY.

On motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the House went into Committee on the Act to establish one uniform currency for the Dominion.

Mr. McDONALD, of Lunenburg, reverted to the views he had expressed on this subject, on a previous day, when the resolutions on which the bill is founded were before the House, observing he had acknowledged that on two successive occasions the Government had given way on this matter at the request of the representatives of Nova Scotia; and at the session of 1870, at an interview of the majority of them with the Finance Minister, an understanding was had that if, by the present session, there appeared to be no reasonable prospect of the realization of the international coinage project, they would not offer further resistance to the proposed assimilation, recognizing the fact that it must take place sooner or later. He also took the ground when speaking formerly on the subject; that while the representatives of Nova Scotia were consenting parties to the assimilation he thought it was but reasonable on their part to ask that the time selected therefor would be one as little inconvenient as possible for that Province. He felt that, so far as it concerned Ontario and Quebec, it was not a matter of serious importance. The matter, in its business aspect, was one chiefly between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, at least the greater portion of the latter. Several of the counties of that Province were largely in favour of an assimilation; still as it would injuriously affect the city of Halifax and all the eastern part of Nova Scotia, forming by far the larger portion of the Province, he thought the House might in all fairness consider if it would not be well that the change should be made in such a way and at such a time as to affect it as little injuriously as possible. The people of Ontario and Quebec had got rid of their silver nuisance, for which they could not be too grateful to the Finance Minister; and the explanations that honorable gentleman made, in bringing down those reso-

lutions, showed that everything the Government could do would be done to prevent a similar difficulty overtaking Nova Scotia. But there were certain elements in the business condition of that Province which did not exist in these upper Provinces, and that would make it practically impossible for any Finance Minister, no matter how skilful, to prevent those British coins, which, under the operations of this Act, would be practically a depreciated currency, from getting into circulation in Nova Scotia. Several of their eastern counties dealt largely with Newfoundland, this export trade being to a great extent carried on by individual farmers, who placed their separate ventures of stock or dairy produce on board small vessels, the captains of which acted as their agents and brought back in payment, not bills of exchange, but British coin. In this way, no matter what legislation might be adopted, and no matter how thoroughly the banks and merchants of Nova Scotia might be supplied with Dominion coinage, in this way, from time to time, large quantities of British gold and silver would enter the eastern counties, and form a practical inconvenience very difficult to get rid of. Again, the city and port of Halifax now formed the principal naval and military station of Britain on this side the Atlantic. The soldiers and sailors were paid in British coin, which it would be impossible to keep out of circulation. Thus Nova Scotia, unlike the other Provinces, would have a silver nuisance. Another consideration he mentioned a few days ago ought to have some weight. The Nova Scotia contracts for the Intercolonial Railway embraced a large amount of money, and the difference in the currencies when the contracts were taken, left a margin in favour of the contractors upon which they had counted. The amount was about one million dollars, the two and a half per cent upon which reached \$25,000, a pretty serious item to be deducted from their profits. Paid in Dominion currency themselves, the contractors paid their workmen in Nova Scotia currency, but would hereafter have \$1 instead of 97 cents to pay. He believed these contractors would have a fair, equitable claim upon the Government for compensation for the losses they would suffer from the operation of this bill. If the House would consent to his amendment postponing the proposed changes a few months, the Government would be to a large extent relieved of that difficulty, because in that time one and possibly two of these contracts would be finished. He was aware of the difficulty experienced by the St. John merchants through this depreciated cur-

rency. But he put it to the members from that Province whether it was fair to ask Nova Scotia to surrender everything and they nothing. Admitting an assimilation ought to take place, should Nova Scotia have no say as to when it should come into effect? The delay he proposed could not be a serious matter to any business interests of New Brunswick—its refusal might be to the business interests of Nova Scotia. The interests of the two Provinces were in the main identical, although there might be some slight difference on the point now under discussion; and in the interests of the two Provinces; and for the promotion of the good will and community of feeling without which their best interests could not be advanced, he asked the representatives of New Brunswick to meet their friends of Nova Scotia half way in this currency matter, and grant the brief delay asked for, since the latter were conceding the principle of the measure which the former had so strongly urged. He would move in amendment, that the first clause of the Bill be amended by substituting the word January for July, and omitting the word "present" in the first line, and substituting the figures 1872 for 1871 in the second clause.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON very cordially supported the motion of the member for Lunenburg. The representatives of Nova Scotia assented to the main principle of the Bill, and he trusted the Government would yield to them when they made a reasonable request that the change might take place at a time which would be most convenient.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON also hoped that the Government would accede to the proposition. As Nova Scotia was to experience the inconvenience of the change, he thought that inconvenience should be made as slight as possible.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the Government had very fully considered the whole matter but could not accede to the proposition for postponement. The matter was not one that affected Nova Scotia alone, but New Brunswick also was very deeply interested, and there was just as much feeling in one Province as in the other. The change had already been postponed against the strong representations and remonstrances of New Brunswick. The time when the Bill should come into operation was very fully considered, and it was decided that the 1st July was the most appropriate time. The Government could not, therefore, accede to the proposed amendment.

Mr. CURRIER (Ottawa) referred to the change from pounds shillings and pence

Mr. McDonald.

to dollars and cents, which had caused but little inconvenience, and he could not think that the people of Nova Scotia would suffer much more inconvenience from the proposed change than those of Canada had from that referred to.

Mr. CHIPMAN dissented from the assertion that the N. S. members were unanimous in admitting the necessity for the proposed change. He thought the people of Nova Scotia were likely to be the best judges of the inconvenience they would experience. Their opinion on the subject had been expressed in several ways that could not fail to arrest the attention of the House. The Legislature of the Province had almost unanimously expressed an opinion hostile to the change; and we know from the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and confirmed by the British Government, that there is no other way in which the public opinion of a country can be constitutionally ascertained. Besides that, we have the opinions of the Chamber of Commerce and of the merchants and bankers of Halifax, and, last of all, the almost unanimous opinion of the representatives of the Province in this House. He thought that in response to a request so general the Government might well yield a simple matter of detail such as that asked, and he was convinced that their refusal would cause very great dissatisfaction, and he felt bound to enter his protest against their action.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON did not see that the gentlemen from Nova Scotia had any cause for complaint, and they were certainly not unanimous in desiring the postponement of the operation of the Bill.

Mr. CHIPMAN remarked that members from other Provinces were always allowed to make their complaints, which were received with consideration, whereas when a representative of Nova Scotia got up he was always taunted with bringing up a grievance.

Mr. McDONALD (Glengarry) would support the amendment, as it would perhaps remove the last Nova Scotia "grievance."

Mr. ROSS (Victoria) thought the request for postponement very reasonable, and that there ought to be no hesitation in acceding to it.

Mr. COFFIN was also in favour of the postponement.

Mr. OLIVER thought the request of the people of Nova Scotia just and reasonable, as the inconvenience ought to be made as slight as possible. Referring to the removal of the silver nuisance, he could not agree that the Government were entitled to much credit on that account, as after allowing the nuisance to exist for years,

they had only made an effort to remove it when forced to do so by the pressure brought upon them by the House.

Mr. SAVARY denied that the people of Nova Scotia were unanimous in desiring a postporement. He had consulted with his constituents, and was quite prepared to support the Government—and he did not think he stood alone. The member for King's had complained that the Local Legislature was ignored. He, however, was not prepared to be unduly influenced by the representations of that Legislature, for he thought that neither Legislature had the right to dictate to the other. He considered that the Act should come into operation at the earliest date possible—and the commencement of the financial year of the Dominion was certainly the most appropriate time;—and he thought that if the first of July was adhered to, the people would become so well accustomed to the change that they would on the first of January be able to open their books without trouble, —and the assimilation would very soon be regarded as a great benefit.

In reply to Mr. SAVARY Mr. CHIPMAN said that either Mr. Savary or Mr. Vail, his colleague in the Local Legislature at Halifax, was misrepresenting the constituency of Digby in this matter for their conduct was diametrically opposite, or lees the constituents were divided in opinion and each representative gave expression to the views of his friends. There at least could be no doubt that Mr. Vail stood very high in the estimation of the people of his county. Mr. S. says he has consulted his constituents. He (Mr. C.) had also consulted his. Referring to a letter from a gentleman at Wolfville, quoted in a former debate by the President of the Council, he remarked that he had the very highest respect for the gentleman who wrote that letter, and that in most matters his opinions were entitled to very great consideration. But in this instance he believed the opinions of that gentleman were not the opinions of a majority of the intelligent people of King's County, and since it seemed to be the custom to read letters as indicating popular opinion, he begged leave also to refer to a letter he had received from his county, which says:—"Both parties in this county are very much opposed to the change being made, and the more strongly it is opposed the better—if the change is inevitable, the 1st of January is the most suitable time for it to come into operation." That letter was written by Mr. Harris, a gentleman of commanding influence in the county a Confederate, and who was also a candidate in the interest of that party at the last election. He again urged upon the Govern-

ment the propriety of granting the very moderate concession asked for.

Mr. DUFRESNE thought the member for King's was scarcely justified in complaining that the grievances of Nova Scotia did not receive equal consideration with those of other Provinces, and referred to the time of Confederation, when every justice had been done to Nova Scotia.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS thought the member for King's had not done the Government justice, in complaining that it had no consideration for the opinions of the members from Nova Scotia, as it had given the utmost consideration possible to those opinions, but they had to look at the question in a general point of view, and not from a Nova Scotia standpoint only. As to the time, he could not but think that the inconvenience had been greatly exaggerated. All difficulty might have been entirely removed, if the Banking interest of Halifax and Nova Scotia generally had co-operated with the Government. He had proposed to them during the last Session, that they should agree to redeem their notes in the city of St. John, and had offered to make special deposits with them to enable them to do so without difficulty, but they refused. He desired to impress on the representatives from Nova Scotia that the Government had given their most earnest attention to the matter, and had not been able to see that Nova Scotia would suffer any very great inconvenience—of course there must necessarily be some inconvenience; but it would be very slight and temporary.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that he should move to insert a clause as a proviso to the 8th section, to provide; that for and during the period of six months after the operation of the Act, the Dominion Government should be bound to redeem all the silver coin in Nova Scotia on the basis of its present value in that Province. He pointed out that 24c to the shilling was not quite equivalent to \$4 86 $\frac{2}{3}$ to the sovereign, and as the Dominion Government had incurred so much expense in removing the "Silver Nuisance" from Ontario and Quebec, he thought they should bear the loss, if any, in the case of Nova Scotia.

Hon. JOS. HOWE said that when Nova Scotia had a grievance to complain of there was not a man in the House more willing to see it removed than himself; [hear, hear,] but he objected to having the name of the Province bandied about in this Legislature as eternally complaining of something. He narrated at some length the history of the Province of Nova Scotia. The currency of his Province was not the currency of any other country in the world. While it was admirably suited

for a small community, it did not serve for trade with other communities. Now it was proposed to give to Nova Scotia the currency of the continent, and the boon would be appreciated by the people of that Province after giving the new system a fair trial. He denied that any loss would result from the change, for merchants would have plenty of time to prepare for it.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS, promised that the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax should receive consideration at the hands of the Government.

The remaining clauses of the Bill were carried, and the Committee rose and reported:

Mr. JONES [Halifax] moved that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the first clause of the Bill by inserting the following words: "That the Act shall not take effect until the 1st January, 1872."

The House divided on the amendment, which was lost—Yeas 24, nays 90.

YEAS.—Messrs. Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Coffin, Delorme, Dorion, Forbes, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Geoffrion, Godin, Harrison, Holton, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Killam, Kirkpatrick, McDonald [Glengarry], McDonald [Lunenburg], Mills, Oliver, Pearson, Pelletier, Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Senecal, Smith, Tremblay.—27.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Archambault, Ault, Baker, Beatty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bolton, Bourassa, Brown, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Peel), Campbell, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cimon, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Grant, Grover, Hincks (Sir Francis), Howe, Jackson, Keeler, Kempt, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Little, Masson (Soulanges), McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, McMonies, Merritt, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Morrison (Niagara), Paquet, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pozer, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ryan (King's, N. B.), Savary, Scatnerd, Sriver, Simard, Simpson, Street, Sylvain, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Wallace, Walsh, Webb, Whitehead, Willson, Workman, Wright (Ottawa County)—90.

The report was received.

A message from His Excellency was read, recommending to the favourable consideration of the House, a series of resolutions respecting the admission of

British Columbia into the Union of Canada.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. WORKMAN introduced a Bill to incorporate the Montreal Insurance Company of Canada.

A return of the monies received on account of private bills was laid on the table.

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. STREET in the chair.

The following items passed through Committee:—Legislation, Miscellaneous \$57,000; Geological Survey and observatories, \$46,700; Marine Hospitals, \$39,000; Pensions, \$53,533.

In response to the wishes of the Opposition, the estimates for Public Works and Buildings, chargeable to capital, were left over for the present.

On item 12, being a vote of \$145,441 for Ocean and River Steam and Packet service,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected to the cost of repairs and maintenance of the steamers *Napoleon III* and *Lady Head and Druid* (\$62,500) during the fiscal year. He thought that Dominion steamers were pretty costly.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said an effort had been made to sell the *Druid*, but it had failed. It was thought better to keep the vessel than to sell it at a very low cost.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought that it was unwise to maintain these vessels.

After some further discussion the item was carried.

On the item of \$39,541.00 subsidy, payable to the Inman Line between Halifax and Cork,

Mr. WORKMAN complained that the trips of the Inman Steamers had been irregular. The boats had not always been up to time.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied that the Inman Line had done the service agreed upon quite up to the terms of the contract. True, the work was not as well done as by the Cunard Steamers; but the latter Company had refused to work any longer, and it was necessary to contract with the Inman Company.

Mr. JONES, of Halifax, said doubtless they had accomplished all they undertook, but it was desirable to have the service better done. Superior vessels and more satisfactory time were needed.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER stated that the Government would neglect no means of improving the service. They were seeking

Hon. Mr. Howe

tenders from the Allan, Cunard, Anchor and Inman Lines at present, and would make the best arrangement possible.

The item was carried.

On the item of \$15,000 for steam communication between Quebec and the Maritime Provinces,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he would not object to the item this year, but he hoped that Government would consider the necessity of leaving these matters to the operation of the natural laws of trade.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said there was no doubt that it was preferable that a service like this should be performed by contract, but formerly the "Napoleon" and "Lady Head" were employed in this particular service. They required no subsidy, for they were owned by the Government, but when this service came to be performed otherwise, a subsidy was granted. He believed no hon. member would underrate the importance of this service, until the completion of the Intercolonial Railway would give the easiest and most perfect communication with the Maritime Province that could be obtained. The very moment that the service could be made self-sustaining, the Government would withdraw the subsidy.

Mr. JOLY hoped that Government would not pledge themselves to withdraw the subsidy from this line, until it became clear that it could be done without injury to the service.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that when this subsidy was granted, it was supposed that in a year or two, when the trade between Quebec and the Lower Provinces should be developed, that capitalists would find that source enough to keep up the line. But, it seemed that notwithstanding the expected increase of trade, it had not become sufficiently great to sustain this line of steamers. He assumed this was the conclusion to which the Government had come. If it were true that so little trade passed along that line, under all these circumstances no large amount of traffic could be looked for to pass over the Intercolonial Railway line when finished. He joined in the hope that the Government would take steps to notify the owners of these lines that the subsidy would be abolished next year.

In reply to Mr. D. A. MACDONALD, Hon. Mr. LANGEN said that the contract was for three years, and would expire this year. Next year, if possible, Government would withdraw the subsidy.

Mr. WORKMAN said a commercial line at present carried on a good business between Montreal and the Toronto ports. The traffic had quadrupled in four years.

He did not, therefore, see why the service should cost so much, and hoped, when the present contract expired, an important retrenchment would be made. There should be no need of subsidies.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said the steamers had to refuse freight at Quebec last summer.

On the item of \$3,000 for steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the ports of the Dominion,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked information. He saw no necessity for this item,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said this expenditure was the result of an unexpired agreement between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and the increased outlay was occasioned by an extension of the service. The money was beneficially spent.

After some humorous conversation, the item was carried.

On the item of steam communication between Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth \$10,000,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explanations. He could not see on what ground the item was to be defended, unless the Government undertook to do the carrying and commercial business of all the different little ports of the Dominion.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that the service was considered so important in Nova Scotia, that its Government before the Union voted this \$10,000 to carry it on. The trade was most important and beneficial to the interests of the country generally. This item was voted before, but last year it was not possible to get the service performed.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked what service it was for. He did not believe it came within the scope of the Government's functions. This practice might be extended and abused to an extent quite demoralizing and hurtful to the interests of the Dominion. He feared this vote would establish a bad precedent.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) defended the item on the ground of past Canadian practice and the usefulness of this coast service in developing the trade of the Western coast of Nova Scotia with New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON contended the establishment of a steam line between Halifax and the Bay of Fundy, was a simple operation and within the scope of legitimate commercial enterprise, with which Government had nothing to do.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said all the railways in Nova Scotia ran to the north, but on the south an important fishing interest had sprung up, which it was very important

should be connected with the railway communication, and that was the object of the steam service.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the object was to connect the two Provinces, not one part of a Province with another. The railway did not meet the case. As increasing trade was arising, the arrangement would be very advantageous.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that nothing which was fairly in the compass of private enterprise should be taken up by the Government.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY mentioned other cases in which the principle of helping such a line of steamers had been recognised by Parliament. A former appropriation had now been exhausted, and a new one was needed. The object was in no way a sectional matter.

Mr. MAGILL considered the matter sectional and was opposed to the vote.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the matter could certainly not be considered out of the province of the Dominion Government, as it was a steam service connecting two Provinces, and the fact that the vessels stopped at intermediate ports in no way altered the case. The hon. member for Chateauguay had objected that the service was sectional, but such was not the case.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had argued not that the vote was sectional, but was unsound in interfering with matters of Trade.

Mr. BOLTON asked whether the steamer would run from Halifax to St. John.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the same steamer might not run, but the service was the same.

Mr. BOLTON said if the steamer was merely to run to Yarmouth, there to connect with some other line, it was clearly a local service.

Mr. KILLAM maintained that to withdraw the grant would be a great injustice and that the matter could in no way be considered local. The steamers took large amounts of produce from Upper Canada, and the line could not be run without a subsidy at present.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) thought they might just as well subsidize a line of steamers from Montreal to Kingston.

Mr. BOLTON objected to the principle of the grant, as under it any number of lines might be subsidized.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought that in every expenditure, the necessity ought to be shewn, which certainly had not been shown in this case.

The item was then passed.

Hon. Mr. Howe.

The item of \$2,000 for communication from St. John to ports in Basin of Minas—Passed.

On the item of \$12,000 for Tug service between Montreal and Kingston,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had opposed the grant from its commencement, and did so still. He considered it rather an impediment than an encouragement to trade, as it prevented competition. He hoped the Government would discontinue the service.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the grant had commenced in 1849, but in one year it was discontinued, and the result was that the service was very badly performed, so much so that the grant was subsequently renewed, and had been continued ever since. The Government proposed to continue it another year, and at another session, after receiving the report of the Canal Commission, they could say whether the service could be performed without the subsidy.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the Company were bound to any fixed rates.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied in the affirmative.

Mr. WORKMAN thought the vote should not be rescinded.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought that private competition would supply everything wanted:

After some further discussion the item passed.

Mr. JONES [Halifax] referred to a pension granted to Mr. Duckett, which had been founded on his retiring allowance and not on his former salary.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY explained that Mr. Duckett was one of two, who had been found doing nothing at all, and who had been superannuated, but they could only be allowed the amount authorised by law, based on the salary for three years previous.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER also explained the case, admitting the equity of the case and promising re-consideration.

On the item of \$2400 for the Quebec Observatory,

Mr. MILLS had expected that some particulars of the work done by the Observatories would have been supplied before another vote was asked.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER explained that the Quebec Observatory was in charge of the Marine and Fisheries, and the report of Commander Ashe would be found in the statement of that department.

Item passed.

On the item of \$4800 for Toronto Observatory,

Mr. WORKMAN asked why the Observatory at Toronto got double the amount assigned to that of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. HOWE explained that the ultimate design of the Observatories was to ascertain when storms might be expected, so as to warn those on the coasts, the observatory at Toronto being more extensive than that at Quebec.

Item of \$500 for Kingston Observatory—Passed.

Item of \$500 for Montreal Observatory—Passed.

Item of \$1500 for Halifax Observatory—Passed.

Item of \$1000 for New Brunswick Observatory, after some conversation.—Passed.

Item of \$1000 for repairs at Quebec.—Passed.

Item of \$5000 for Meteorological Observatories, including instruments.—Passed.

Item of \$30,000 for Geological survey.—Passed.

The item of \$3890 for salaries and contingent expenses of Statistical office, Halifax, after some conversation.—Passed.

Item of \$1880 for salaries of 316 Deputy Registrars, Nova Scotia, and allowance for getting Marriage Returns—after its being questioned whether the expense should not be borne by the Local Government.—Passed.

Item of \$360,000 for taking the Census,

In reply to Hon. Mr. Holton, Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said that the amount voted last year in addition to that now asked for would be expended.

Item carried.

Item of \$18,212 for immigration agents and employees.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) characterised the salary of the agent at Halifax as a waste of public money.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER defended the appointment, denying the hon. member's statement as to Mr. Clay being unknown at Halifax. The duties of that officer, in view of the steamers filled with emigrants touching at that port, were not important, and it would be a mean and ill-judged omission to leave the great maritime port of Nova Scotia without an officer of this kind. He condemned the spirit and notions at the bottom of this objection.

Mr. JONES disclaimed the notion of any personal hostility in this matter, maintaining his remarks were suggested by public considerations.

After some further discussion, during which Mr. D. Macdonald condemned the

appointment and Mr. Macdonald, of Lunenburg, defended it,

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said they must have an agent at Halifax to do duty in connection with emigrants, and to avoid the suspicion of doing anything or leaving anything undone calculated to draw emigrants away from that port.

In reply to Hon. Mr. DORION,

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN stated, in 1867, 781 emigrants landed at Halifax; in 1868, 366; in 1869, 448; in 1870, 437

Item carried.

Item of \$2,600 for Medical inspection, Port of Quebec—Carried.

\$12,000 for Quarantine at Gross Isle—Passed.

\$3,900 for Quarantine at St. John, N.B.—Passed.

\$4,460 for Quarantine at Halifax—Passed.

\$14,000 for Travelling expenses and contingencies in Europe and Canada—Passed.

\$45,000 to meet possible expenses of immigration.

Mr. WORKMAN said he thought the sum expended by St. George's Society, of Montreal, for feeding and clothing English immigrants last summer, should have been included in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said if the Government undertook such responsibilities it would have to meet scores of such claims from all parts of the country. The Local Government were the proper parties to apply to. The relief of these people was a private benevolent duty, and the Canadian Government would be foolish in reimbursing this or any other society for such reasonable outlay.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the principle sought to be introduced by the member for Montreal Centre, most objectionable.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN replied there was excuse in the present instance, as there were no emigrant sheds at Montreal. He would see that no such claims should be acknowledged by the Dominion, but that they should be referred to the Local Governments.—Item passed.

The Committee then rose, and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on Monday.

The House then adjourned at 11:25.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, 20th March, 1871.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

INTEREST.

Hon. Mr. DEVER gave notice of an en-

quiry respecting the regulation of a common rate of interest throughout the Dominion.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN deferred his enquiry respecting the admission of British Columbia into the Union until to-morrow.

RICHIBUCTOU.

Hon. Mr. WARK—In putting the question respecting Richibuctou on a former occasion I stated very fully the necessity of some improvement being made in that harbour. I am now happy to learn that the Minister of Public Works has given a pledge that a dredge which has been purchased in Scotland will be first employed next season in the harbour. I stated also on the former occasion—and I repeat it now—that mere dredging will not be sufficient to make any permanent improvement. It is absolutely necessary that some permanent structure should be constructed as soon as possible, and therefore it is that I put the present question:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates for the present year any sum of money to provide for the permanent improvement of the Harbor of Richibucto?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I may state in answer to the hon. gentleman that the Government have not failed to consider the advisability of improving the harbor of Richibuctou. He says that the Minister of Public Works had made arrangements for obtaining a dredge which would be first employed on that harbour. Now if he based such a statement on anything I said the other day I wish to set him right.

Hon. Mr. WARK—I never said so.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I stated that the Minister of Public Works had taken steps to obtain a suitable dredge for the improvement of the harbours of the North Shore, and that doubtless it would be employed at Richibuctou during the current year. I also added that there was a sum in the Estimates for dredging—\$30,000—in connection with that boat. The hon. member has also stated that he believes that simple dredging will not be sufficient. Now I may tell him that the local representative of the County of Kent (Mr. Renaud) last year pressed on the Minister of Public Works the necessity of making permanent improvements on the harbour, and in consequence of those representations the Minister of Public Works engaged a suitable person to watch the currents and effects of the ice on the harbour in order to make a report which would enable the Government to see what was

Hon. Mr. Dever.

necessary to be done to improve it. As soon as that report is made the matter will receive the most serious consideration of the Minister of Public Works and of the Government.

PRINTING.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON moved the adoption of the fifth report of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The motion was carried.

SYNOD BILL.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT moved the second reading of the Bill to extend provisions of the church of England Synod Act to New Brunswick; and in doing so, stated that the object was simply to enable the Synod of that Province to join the Synod of Canada, and that all parties had agreed to its passage.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN seconded the motion.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill (House of Commons) to prevent corrupt practices in connection with the collection of the revenue. Its object, he stated, was to punish officers of the inland revenue who might take bribes, as well as those persons who might offer such.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL seconded the motion.

The Bill was read a second time.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 20th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After Routine.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN in reply to Hon. Mr. SMITH said it was not the fault of the engineers if their report of the Bay Verte Canal had not been completed sooner. Eight or ten days of the best part of the season had been lost through troubles with the men. The people in the neighborhood, too, had interfered and delayed the survey by destroying the surveyors marks.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER brought down the returns respecting the defence of the country up to the 17th of February, from 1st May 1870. He said there were more papers to be copied yet.—Referred to the Printing Committee.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT suggested that arrangements be made for having an accurate report made of the Debates on the British Columbia measure.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON approved of the suggestion.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government would consider the matter.

While on his feet he would mention that with due diligence the House might be prorogued at Easter (cheers). He would therefore move, without giving formal notice, that sittings be held on Saturdays, and that Government Orders have precedence.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) hoped the Government would not comply with the suggestion of the hon. member for Sherbrooke and the hon. member for Chateaugay. The local papers gave very fair reports and he thought there was no necessity for anything further.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was reminded that next Saturday would be a statutory holiday, but it would be well to make Thursday a Government day. He moved a resolution to that effect, which was carried.

Mr. SCRIVER referred to the regulations affecting the distribution of land grants in Manitoba, and asked the intention of the Government with respect to the Volunteers who had already been discharged.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said they would be entitled to the same privileges as other Volunteers in Manitoba. All connected with the expedition would be dealt with in the most liberal manner.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—

Bill No. 19. An Act to authorize the incorporated Village of Trenton to impose and collect Harbour Dues, and for other purposes—Mr. Brown.

Bill No. 28. An Act to extend the provisions of the Act authorizing the imposition and collection of Harbour Dues by the Corporation of the Town of Owen Sound—Mr. Snider.

Mr. SCATCHERD asked whether it is the intention of the Government to place the Volunteers called out during the last Fenian raid on the same footing in respect to a grant of land with the Volunteers in Manitoba.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the Volunteers who were good and generous enough to hire themselves for a year or perhaps for two years, if required, must receive special considerations from the Government, but it was intended that those who served during the last Fenian

raid should be remunerated in this way. As a matter of course, to all Volunteers who served in repelling the Fenian raid, the Government would be willing to facilitate as much as possible their obtaining free grants of land on condition of settlement.

Mr. MILLS asked whether the contractors of sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Intercolonial Railway who have thrown up their contracts have been relieved from their obligations; and whether the Government have in any way promised or agreed to indemnify such of those contractors and their sureties as may have performed work in excess of the amount paid before the abandonment of such contracts; and also whether any payment or promise of payment has been made of liabilities incurred by the contractors to third parties?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN replied in the negative to all these questions.

Mr. MAGILL moved for copies of the Commission and instructions to commissioners on the subject of canal enlargement, &c.—Carried.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 11) to annex the village of Seaforth to the South Riding of the county of Huron.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the constituencies would be re-adjusted after the completion of the census. He hoped the hon. member would let the Bill drop.

Mr. CAMERON said as the village stood at present, if an election should take place before the next elections, Seaforth would be disfranchised. If at the completion of the census, it should be found that no increase has taken place in the county, no redistribution would take place, and the village would have no voice in the legislation for this Dominion. It was immaterial to him whether the village was annexed to the North or to the South Riding so long as the inhabitants could be properly represented.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was very unlikely that any elections would take place in Ontario before the redistribution of constituencies, and he thought this House should wait until the change should take place in the regular way. They did not know what political party they might be serving by annexing the village to any particular riding.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the Bill should be referred to a special committee. It was manifestly unjust that the village should be disfranchised.

The Bill was allowed to stand over.

Mr. BOURASSA moved that the House go into Committee to consider certain resolutions for the creation of a special fund, to be denominated "The Liquor Inspection Fund."

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the Bill if carried would entail great expense. There was no doubt that a great deal of the liquors used in the country were adulterated. The Bill was out of order, as it proposed the creation of a new office.

The Bill was ruled out of order and was dropped.

On motion to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Harrison for the second reading of Bill (No. 29)—An Act to remove doubts as to the liability to Stamp Duties of Premium Notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.

The SPEAKER ruled as follows: That the Bill is to remove doubts, and declares that certain notes shall be deemed to be promissory notes within the meaning of the Act 31 Vic. chap. 9, and shall be subject to the duties thereby imposed; and it provides that all such notes heretofore given and not stamped shall be made valid by a double stamp. There being no appropriation of money proposed, there need be no recommendation from the Crown; and the objection rests on the ground that as it involves an additional charge on the people, the Bill should have originated in Committee of the Whole, and, moreover, should have been proposed by a Minister. It appears to me that the Bill is merely declaratory, and that it involves no new charge except in so far as the double stamps duty may effect that purpose. On looking carefully at the 31st Vic., chap. 9, I find by section 7 that the Governor in Council may declare that any kind or class of circumstances, as to which doubts exist, shall be chargeable with any and what duty under the Act, and by sections 10, 11, and 12, provisions are enacted to render valid notes in the hands of innocent holders and notes passed to third parties. The provision as to double stamps in the present Bill is merely an extension of a former Act in its remedial clauses to the class of notes here declared to be within that Act. The Bill is one which, therefore, in my opinion, may be properly introduced and proceeded with by a private member. The question generally whether private members may introduce and proceed upon measures relating to taxation, which was discussed in the course of the argument, is one of very great importance, and, though not needful to the discussion of the present objections, I think it proper to say a few words upon it to the House. Instances may undoubtedly be found in the journals of the English House of Commons, of Bills and motions by private members to increase taxation, some of which have passed unchallenged; whilst in other cases the indirect assent

of a Minister has been deemed sufficient. Recently, however, (in 1869) a high authority, Sir Thomas Erskine May, stated before a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament that, "no private member is permitted to propose an Imperial tax upon the people—it must proceed from a Minister of the Crown, or be in some other form declared to be necessary for the public service." I think the House may properly accept of this as the correct construction of the rules regulating the introduction of similar measures. The motion or Bill should either be introduced by a Minister, or if introduced by a private member (a practice which should not be encouraged) a Minister should assume the responsibility of it by signifying the consent of the Government to its being entertained by the House. If the House agree with me as to the desirability of adopting the constitutional restriction, it will become my duty to enforce the observance of the rule hereafter.

After some discussion on the point of order,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected to the Bill on its merits. It was an *ex post facto* measure, an Act to give vitality to securities now dead.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the course of the hon. member for Chateauguay was rather inconsistent. When the Bill was under discussion before the hon. member had informed the House that he would have no objection to it, if the Government would introduce it. Now, the hon. member objected to it on its merits. He (Mr. Morris) thought it was very desirable that the Bill should pass to remove doubts as to the validity of securities issued by Mutual Insurance Companies.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he had made no reference whatever as to the merits of the Bill in the former discussion on it. In fact, he could not have expressed any opinion of the kind until the point of order was decided.

Hon. Mr. SMITH thought that some such measure was a necessity, and he should support it.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT would be very unwilling to favour any legislation which would tend to cover any violation of the laws, or, by retrospective enactments to make persons liable to contracts which had become null. He thought the measure now proposed was very necessary, as in consequence of there being no doubt as to the liability of Promissory Notes to stamp duty, it would enable such Notes as otherwise might be illegal to be rendered valid by the payment of double duty. He was decidedly in favor of the increase.

Hon. Mr. Morris.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole on Wednesday next.

EXCISE DUTIES.

The House then went into Committee to consider the following resolutions.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON in the chair.

1. That it is expedient to amend section 7, of the Inland Revenue Act, 1868, Vic. c. 50, by providing that, paraffine wax in a solid state, grease for lubricating purposes and being fluid, lubricating oil made from crude petroleum without being subjected to any process of distillation, tar and other refuse removed from the still without passing through the worm or condenser, and any article produced from such tar or refuse without further process of distillation shall be exempt from any duty of excise.

2. That it is expedient to amend section 29, of the Act 33 Vic., cap. 3 (to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba), by authorizing the Governor in Council to reduce all or any of the duties of excise, payable in the said Province during the period of three years from the passing of the said Act, under any provisions of the laws of Canada respecting inland revenue, which he may see fit to declare applicable to the said Province, to such rates as he may deem expedient in view of the duties of customs payable during that period on like articles imported into the said Province.

In reply to Hon. Mr. HOLTON, Hon. Mr. MORRIS explained that the Manitoba Act had continued the excise laws in force in the old Province of Assiniboia, for a period of three years, but it was found that in consequence the people of Manitoba were not in so good a position with regard to some articles as were the people of other Provinces, and the object of the Bill was to place them in the same position by giving discretionary power to the Governor in Council to conform the duties of Excise to those of Customs.

Mr. HOLTON objected to this power being given to the Government, as vesting in them the power of fixing taxation which should only belong to the House.

The resolutions were passed; report to be received to-morrow.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the second reading of Bill [No. 53] an Act relating to Banks and Banking.

Motion carried and Bill referred to the Standing Committee on Banks and Commerce.

FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER moved the second

reading of Bill [No. 48] "an Act further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels"—[from Senate]. He explained that under the present law, a vessel on being seized was compelled to be taken to the nearest port and placed under the jurisdiction of the nearest Customs officer. The House would easily understand that there might be many cases in which the nearest Customs Officer might not be in a position to protect the vessel and it was therefore proposed that the vessel should be sent to any port as directed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It also proposed to vary in some degree the mode of distributing the proceeds of seizures.

Hon. Mr. SMITH said there could be no objection to the first portion of the measure, and if it was necessary that there should be any distribution of prize money, the second portion might be very desirable, but he was decidedly of opinion that parties effecting any capture should be above all suspicion of having any pecuniary interest in the result of the seizure, and that they should in no way partake of the proceeds.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON read the second portion of the Bill, and objected that it was a measure that could not be originated in the Senate.

Consideration of measure therefore postponed.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of Bill No 42, "An Act further to amend the Act securing the Independence of Parliament." He explained that the object of the Bill was to place the law on the Independence of Parliament in the same position as it had been under the old Act of the Parliament of Canada, rendering it incompetent for the Government to employ any member of the House in any service whatever.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON accepted the Bill very cordially as a step in the right direction, but did not think it went far enough. It was illusory to suppose that it reverted to the system under the old Province of Canada, as there was nothing to prevent officers such as Registrars and Sheriffs from sitting in the House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER pointed out that under the old law those officers had been appointed by the Province, but as the Dominion Government had no power over those officers there was no reason why they should be excluded from the House.

Mr. WELLS (Bothwell) said that under

the Insolvent Act. Sheriffs were charged with many duties from the Dominion Government, and there was no doubt that if they did not discharge those duties properly the Government would find means to punish them, and maintained that there were precisely the same reasons for excluding a Sheriff from the Dominion Parliament as there were to exclude him from the Local Legislature.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was surprised the hon. member did not see the difference. Sheriffs were not appointed or paid by the Dominion Government, nor had that Government any power to dismiss them.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that there were good reasons for excluding Sheriffs, and other such officers, from Parliament, which he should urge at the proper time. All servants subject to the influence of the Crown ought to be excluded.

Motion passed, and Bill to be referred to a Committee of the whole house to-morrow.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of Bill No. 43: "An Act to amend the Act regulating the Militia and Defence of the Dominion." He explained that its object was to extend the Militia Act to the Province of Manitoba and to British Columbia when admitted into the Dominion. He referred to a previous remark he had made on the subject to the effect that the Militia Law of Canada could not be improved, and read a letter which he had recently received from Mr. Reade, the Registrar of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee, who was well known as an eminent legal man, an eminent Parliamentary man, and a great literary character, and who, on Sir George Cornwall Lewis taking a position in Lord Palmerston's Government, succeeded that gentleman in the temporary management of the *Edinburgh Review*, and who, on the death of Sir George, assumed the management of that publication permanently, in which Mr. Reade stated that he considered the Canadian Militia Law most admirable, and would be well satisfied to see it applied to England.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he supposed the gentleman referred to admired the Militia Bill because it did in Canada what no one had ever yet proposed in England, it established the system of conscription. There might be many in England, who, like Mr. Reade, would be glad to see that system in force there, but there had never yet been a single eminent man, who had dared to propose such a measure to the Imperial Parliament.

Dr. BLANCHET drew attention to the *Mr. Wells*.

report of the Adjutant General, shewing defects in the system, instancing that a District Adjutant General, ranking as Lieut. Colonel, might be placed in command of officers really his senior.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there were many recommendations in the report of the Adjutant General which were well worthy of consideration, and which would no doubt be acted upon as soon as practicable. He promised that the Government would consider the matter.

The motion passed, the Bill to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

NORTH WEST.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of Bill No. 44, "An Act to make further provision for the Government of the North West Territories" (from Senate). He explained that the Bill was simply a re-enactment of what had been passed in the first instance as a temporary measure, it being considered a more advisable mode than continuing the former Act.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he saw no particular objection to the Bill.

Motion carried, and Bill to be referred to a Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

In the items for Penitentiaries,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON called attention to the increase this year as compared with last in regard to Kingston. Then it required but \$112,841, now, however, \$117,091. Both the Warden and Deputy Warden were receiving an augmentation.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the Government were convinced that for the minimum salaries the services of proper Wardens could not be secured. Mr. Creighton was a valuable officer. When they reflected that such an officer had to spend his whole time within the institution, being denied the pleasures of congenial society, and that these officers were men of ability, they would conclude that the Government in allowing the highest salary sanctioned by the law, were acting commendably.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the salary was not excessive, if the officers were suitable. But it was a mistake to suppose that the figures were the measure of their emoluments, they being granted a variety of advantages, including house rent, which went to make their salaries very respectable.

Item passed.

Rockwood Asylum, \$82,734.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON called attention to the increase here also. There was a difference against this year of \$7,000 in the articles of skilled labour and messengers.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—And building materials.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON could not conceive of the connection between these and skilled labour.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said if the Opposition were taking a vote for Public Works, they would say they wanted so much for the buildings, but therein would be comprised skilled labour and materials. It was another way of stating the same thing.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER observed that with regard to Rockwood the Government had a large claim against Ontario for the inmates, amounting to \$47,000.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Not out of this vote. He wished for explanations of the increase this year.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was due to the increase in the number of the inmates.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—The chief increase was in an item having no reference to the number.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—That institution, like every other continued increasing. The cost naturally augmented with the increase of the number of criminal lunatics.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought it would be as well for the hon. gentleman to do a bold thing at once—and he was able to do such things—and admit he knew nothing about the estimate (laughter).

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was not under his control. He had a certain number of figures before him which he also gave to the House (hear, hear, and laughter).

Item carried.

Halifax Penitentiary, \$21,136.

In reply to Hon. Mr. Holton,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said their was a very small increase here, except for building materials. Last year the Penitentiary had no Warden, and the services were temporarily performed by one of the keepers. This year there was an addition, but at the lowest rate of salary for a Warden. The building materials covered the main portion of the increase. Item carried.

Penitentiary St. John, N. B., \$52,173.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said this expenditure in New Brunswick had increased beyond all proportion to that connected with any of the other institutions. He was quite sure the Minister of Customs, who was always ready to make a defence of anything, no matter how monstrous, could say something in favour of this item (hear, and laughter).

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied there was no argumentation in New Bruns-

wick, the present apparent one being the result of an error, instead of \$9,300 for maintenance, there should be but \$6,946, which he moved should be substituted therefor.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that was the most satisfactory explanation of all (hear, hear).

The remaining items under this head, amounting to \$3,500, were agreed to without discussion.

Light-houses and coast service, construction of light houses, fog-trumpets, &c., \$79,700.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he had little information on the subject of this class of items, and hoped some of the hon. members from the coasts would be prepared to correct any errors that might have been committed in the selection of sites for those structures and in other matters. There was no class of appropriations he would vote for with greater pleasure than those for light-houses on the coast (cheers).

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) asked if there was an appropriation for a light-houses at Port Maitland.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER replied in the affirmative. Item carried.

Salaries of light-house keepers, &c., Quebec, \$230,071 carried, as was also that for maintenance of light-houses, \$18,929.

Between Quebec and Montreal—salaries, \$2,880; maintenance, &c., of light-houses, \$6,825.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked what was meant by maintenance.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—All kind of expenses, such as provisions oil, &c.

The remainder of the appropriations under this head were agreed to, the whole amounting to \$303,577.

THE MURDER OF MR. MCGEE.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he had been questioned lately by the hon. member for Chateauguay as to whether any money had been paid in reward for the services in connection with the detection and arrest of the murderer of the late Mr. McGee. He found on enquiry at the office of the Minister of Justice that no portion of the promised reward had been paid. Six or seven applications were under the consideration of the Minister of Justice, but no decision in regard to them had yet been reached.

It being six o'clock the House adjourned.

AFTER RECESS.

The House resumed Committee of Supply. The following items, under the head of "Fisheries," were adopted:

Maintenance and repairs of

Schooner *La Canadienne*. \$9,000 00

Salaries and disbursements of
Fishery Overseers and War-
dens:—

Ontario	\$6,000 00
Quebec	\$7,000 00
New Brunswick	\$7,000 00
Nova Scotia	\$7,000 00

Fishways and Oyster beds and for
Fish Breeding.....\$7,500 00

Additional for the protection of
the Fisheries (Marine Police) \$70,000 00

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected to the last
item, and asked for details.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the cause of the
increase over the vote of last year was be-
cause last year's estimates was insufficient.

After some further discussion the item
was carried.

On the item of \$73,400,

Mr. BOLTON objected to the increase of
\$3 500 over the estimate of last year.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he had promised
last year that the service should be made
self sustaining, and he had done so. The
scale of charges had been so revised as to
enable an increased amount to be met,
and without imposing any undue burden
on the trade. It was not proposed to in-
crease the number of cullers.

After some discussion the following es-
timates comprised under the head of cull-
ing timber, were carried:—

Quebec Office	67,925 00
Montreal do	3,800 00
Sorel do	1,675 00

The detailed item of the estimate \$8,-
500 for steamboat inspection, and \$8,100
for Indians, were carried without discus-
sion.

The following items under the head of
“miscellaneous,” were also carried without
discussion:—

Printing Canada “Gazette”	\$2,500 00
Postage do	1,200 00
Miscellaneous Printing	500 00

Unforeseen Expenses: Expendi-
ture thereof to be under
Order in Council, and a de-
tailed account thereof to be
laid before Parliament, dur-
ing the first fifteen days of
next Session.....75,000 00

Shipping Master's Office, Quebec
Expenses connected with ascer-
taining correct time at Otta-
wa and firing of noon gun... 400 00

Code of Signals and flags for the
Dominion Government.....

Expenses of investigations relat-
ing to wrecks.....1,000 00

Commutation in lieu of remission
of duties on articles import-
ed for the use of the Army
and Navy, to be apportioned
by Order in Council.....40,000 00

To provide for examination and

Hon. Mr. Holton.

classification of Masters and

Mates (Mercantile Marine)... 6,200 00

On the item of \$50,000 to provide one
half of the British share of the Expendi-
ture in reference to surveys of the bound-
ary line, between Canada and United
States of America, on the 49th parallel of
North Latitude.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explana-
tions.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it had
become necessary to settle the boundary
line between the Dominion and the United
States, and the American Government were
prepared to pay one half of the expense.
Great Britain had proposed to Canada to
pay one-fourth of the whole amount, the
Imperial Government paying the other
one-fourth. It would take between two
and three years to complete the work,
and the cost to this country would be some-
thing like \$150,000. The line to be sur-
veyed was about 800 miles in length, ex-
tending from lake of the Woods to the
Rocky Mountains. This action was taken
in consequence of a supposition on the
part of the American Government that
the Hudson's Bay Company had encroach-
ed upon United States Territory.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought that if this
country had a right to bear any part of
the expense we should bear the whole of
it. There was no valid reason that he
could perceive for sharing it between the
two Governments. His own opinion was
that Canada should bear the whole of it,
and show our fellow countrymen at home
that we could bear our own burdens. We
had acquired the North West Territory
and had no idea of surrendering one foot
of it to our neighbors, (hear, hear), and it
was our own business to see that the
boundary line between the two countries
was established.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that the sup-
posed error in the location of the bound-
ary line had been discovered by persons
in the employ of the American Govern-
ment, and as they had no diplomatic
relations with us, they proposed to the
Imperial Government that a Joint Com-
mission should be appointed for the pur-
pose of establishing the boundary line,
and that each Government should bear
half the expenses. The Imperial Govern-
ment applied to the Dominion Government
asking them to pay half the expenses
incurred by Great Britain. He quite
agreed with the hon. member opposite
that this country should bear the whole
of the expense.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL could not see
the necessity for so large an expenditure
as the line had been run once before. He
could not agree with the hon. member for
Chateaugay, in the opinion that Great

Britain should bear none of the expense. Either the Hudson's Bay Company or the Imperial Government ought surely to sell us this Great North West estate with the boundaries properly defined. Under the circumstances, he thought the generosity of Great Britain should be acknowledged by accepting their offer.

Item carried.

On the item of \$400,000 for opening up communication with North West Territory,

In reply to Hon. Mr. HOLTON,

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that when the vote first passed the House, every possible information had been given on the subject.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL thought some details might be supplied as to the manner in which the money would be expended—so that the House ought not to vote so large an amount blindly.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that when the hon. member for North Lanark had been a member of the Government, he had asked for a blind vote for a million and a half of dollars.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL said that on that occasion it was understood that the money would not be expended without being submitted to the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought they were certainly entitled to some information as to the way in which it was intended to expend the money.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had not anticipated that the item would have come up for discussion that evening or he would have had full details of the matter. He might mention, however, among the works to be provided for out of the vote asked for, the building of steam launches for the line between Lake Shebandowan and the north angle of the Lake of the Woods, the building of two steamers for Rainy Lake and the Lake of the Woods, the erection of sheds for the use of emigrants, the completion of the road from Prince Arthur's Landing to Shebandowan Lake, the completion of a number of Portages, some of which were in bad order, the completion of the road from the north west angle of the Lake of the Woods to the eastern end of the 30 miles of road from Fort Garry. On another occasion he would be prepared to supply every information.

Mr. SCATCHERD (Middlesex) thought it a matter of very great regret that in every circumstance connected with the North West there should be so much of mystery, and he thought if this mystery was continued, the sooner Canada got rid of the North West the better; for emigrants would never go there so long as the Government itself was in such entire ignorance on the subject, and he thought it very undesirable that such a large expen-

diture could take place where so little was known.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said that all the expenditure with respect to the North West could be traced in the public accounts, and if anything further was required the proper departments would be most willing to supply it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) said that what was more particularly wanted was information as to the communication with the North West, and he thought the item should be delayed until full particulars could be given. He then spoke of the route proposed by Mr. Dawson, commenting severely on that officer, and the mistakes made by him.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had already undertaken to be prepared to give full information on this matter on a future occasion; but he must repel the accusation brought against Mr. Dawson. He had never known a more able, hard working officer than Mr. Dawson. He had done his work well, and had the full confidence of his department, and the money placed in his hands had been expended well and in the interest of the public, and he could not allow the hon. member to attack the gentleman without defending him, and at the proper time would be prepared to shew that the accusations made against Mr. Dawson, now renewed, were false. As to the expedition which had been sent, if the officers in charge of that expedition had followed the suggestion made by Mr. Dawson, had profited by his experience and his knowledge of the country, a very large sum of money would have been saved to the country, and a great deal of the fatigue and hardship which the troops had to endure would have been avoided. He was sorry that these accusations had been brought at this time when he was not prepared with details, but at the proper time he would be prepared to prove all he had said.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL said that from his knowledge and experience of Mr. Dawson, he would go almost as far in his favour as the Minister of Public Works had gone, in testifying to his devotion to the country and his ability to discharge the duties thrown upon him. If, however, the disregard of the experience and knowledge of the country which Mr. Dawson possessed, had led to a large and unnecessary expenditure the Government was to blame, for if the Government had assumed the whole conduct of the expedition themselves, instead of handing it over to officers who, from their inexperience, were necessarily incompetent, they would without doubt have effected a large saving. He thought that if the survey that had been commenced by the

Hon. Mr. McDougall.

Government when he had been in power, had been carried out, he could look forward with confidence to a good result. Mr. Dawson although he believed him to be a very able man, and capable of forming good opinions on these matters, did not profess to be an engineer of the type of Mr. Page, and fearing, therefore, that some of his estimates might not turn out to be correct the Government thought proper to make a more accurate survey of a part of the route, and the result was that one of Mr. Dawson's propositions for a dam to raise the waters of Lake Shebandowan had been found almost impracticable. Similar mistakes might have been made, and in this rough country, he considered it particularly necessary that the most accurate surveys should be made before deciding on any route, and he hoped the Minister of Public Works would send competent engineers to continue the work from the point where it had left off, and carry it to a conclusion. With reference to Mr. Dawson also, he desired to refer to some reports in the newspapers, and to representations and misrepresentations made with respect to Mr. Dawson's road, but if any one inferred that there was a complete road from Thunder Bay to Shebandowan, they certainly misunderstood Mr. Dawson's statements, and the public reports made on the subject. He must say that a very unfair attack had been made on Mr. Dawson in this respect.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said this appropriation obtained some two years ago, was necessarily a blind one. The Government had to feel their way. He was not prepared to say what would be the cost of the expedition but he could confidently say that it would be under the one million of dollars which had been estimated.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Not much.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER would not hold out any expectation that it would be much below one million of dollars, but still, it would be less than had been anticipated. He regretted that it had been found necessary to expend money in this way, but still the Dominion had gained in one way through it. The world had learned more of it, in consequence of those troubles than would have been acquired in fifty years under ordinary circumstances. The result of that knowledge would be the rapid settlement of the North West. It had shown that there was a route through our own Territory to Manitoba, and that Canada could punish evil-disposed persons wherever they might be found within her borders. The money had not only been necessarily expended in asserting the authority of the Dominion, but out of evil good had come. It had shown the American Government,

and people too, that Great Britain valued the attachment of this country and would maintain the colonial connection. He referred to the articles on the Red River Expedition which had appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and said it was calculated to excite ridicule and nothing else. When Col. Wolesley returned from Manitoba he came by the Dawson route, and that was the highest honour which could be paid to the gentleman who constructed that road. It showed that whatever might be said of the road, it had been chosen by a man who had experience of the country through which it ran, as the best means of communication between Fort Garry and Canada. In reply to the hon. member for North Lanark, he would say that the reason why the Canadian Government had not undertaken the management of the expedition was, that at the time the country was under the control of the Imperial Government, and the Dominion had, therefore, no authority to send an expedition there.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL—That argument won't do.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Why?

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL said if our Government had asked for a transfer of the North West at any time, it would have been made in twenty-four hours.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Canadian Government had not demanded a transfer of the North West Territory from the Imperial Government at the time, because they had no means of putting down the rebellion in mid-winter. It was thought better to leave the matter in their own hands. He thought Hon. Mr. McDougall was wrong in issuing his proclamation at the time he did, but his intention was good. Then, when he found he differed from his colleagues, he ran away from the Government to the Opposition (hear, hear, and laughter from the Opposition.)

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that he could not furnish the details of the expedition referred to. In 1869-'70 it amounted to \$170,150; in 1870, up to December 31st, to \$120,723; a portion of this would be borne by the Imperial Government. Of this there had been expended on the Fort William road, \$173,900; on the road from Fort Garry to the Lake of the Woods, \$53,439; Col. Dennis's survey, \$10,723; and the survey by Mr. Munro, \$3,500; boats for transport service, \$40,573; survey of Northern Route, \$2,034. Expenses to be incurred:—

Transport service (including steam launches).....	\$ 67,729
Two steamers.....	36,000
Contingencies.....	31,271
Oskowdagi Bridge.....	800

Hon. Mr. McDougall.

Fort William road.....	4,200
Small dams and other improve- ments.....	27,000
Lake of the Woods to Fort Garry road.....	60,000
Surveys, &c.....	10,000

\$237,000

Mr. MILLS said the Hon. Minister for Public Works had charged him with misrepresenting the condition of the road. He would inform the hon. member that he had made no statements with respect to the road, but that he had spoken of newspaper reports concerning the road. He would repeat again that he read such reports.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had no intention of charging the hon. member with misrepresenting anything. He merely wished to deny the statements made by certain newspapers concerning the state of the road.

Mr. MILLS said the Hon. Minister of Militia had directly stated that the articles which had appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* were the words of Col. Wolesley. In that article serious charges had been made against the Government, which were either true or false.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—They were false.

Mr. MILLS said that if so, it was all the more necessary that they should be refuted beyond the possibility of a doubt. For the honor of public men in this Dominion they should be proved untrue in as public a manner as they had been circulated.

Hon. Mr. HOWE was not satisfied that the articles in question were written by Colonel Wolesley, and hoped they were not, for if they had been written by him, he certainly was not worthy of the trust reposed in him. He had slandered not only the gentleman on the Treasury Benches, but an hon. gentleman opposite, and indeed every public man in Canada. He considered these articles gross, infamous and false, and therefore he did not believe Colonel Wolesley had written those articles.

Mr. HOLMES (Carleton) alluded to the attack made on Mr. Dawson by the member for Bothwell, and made a few remarks in his defence.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that the Minister of Militia had stated that the expenditure was necessary, and that the expedition was necessary. He was not prepared to dispute that necessity under the circumstances existing last spring, but who were responsible for the necessity? He said most unhesitatingly that hon. gentleman opposite were fully responsible, because they proceeded in utter ignorance of the circumstances of the

country of which they proposed to take possession. That ignorance was admitted by those gentlemen in the legislation they proposed to Parliament later, and for that ignorance, and the large expenditure which had resulted, they must be held responsible.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—We do not deny our responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON continued that the result of the ignorance of hon. gentlemen as to the circumstances of the North West in the autumn of 1869 was blood shed and turmoil, and the necessity for the despatch of a military expedition at a cost of nearly a million dollars. The Minister of Militia had expressed the hope that the expenditure would not amount to so large a sum, but on referring to the Public Accounts, and a return subsequently submitted, it would be found that the expenditure had already exceeded half a million, while a large amount would necessarily have to be added. With reference to the expenditure made by Mr. Dawson for the establishment of a line of communication from Thunder Bay to Fort Garry, he was not prepared to criticise it, but he very much feared that they were frittering away large sums of money without getting any tangible value for it. He feared the Government were not properly seized of a distinct object to be gained by the expenditure. His view was that they should secure a thorough line of communication on some definite plan, and not vote large sums of money in the absence of such a plan.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member for Chateauguay had stated that the Government were responsible in this matter. When the Government brought any measure before the House they explained the object of their propositions, and if the House was satisfied, how could the Government be charged with ignorance. If there was any responsibility it surely must be shared by the House, a majority of which had endorsed the proposals of the Government. After the return of the hon. member for North Lanark and himself from England they reported their proceedings in England, that they had made an arrangement with the Hudson's Bay Company, with the sanction of the Imperial Government. They brought their measure before the House, stated under what circumstances, and under what arrangements the North West Territory was to be transferred, and the House almost unanimously endorsed their proposals. The Government expected that the difficulty was solved and the House shared their expectation, and passed an address for the transfer of the Territory. The hon. member for Chateauguay said

they ought to have known the feelings of the people. Well what they knew they stated, they might have been under some misapprehension, with regard to the welcome of Canadian authority, and he admitted that he himself was disappointed, but everyone was disappointed, no one anticipated that there would be any difficulty. They had been informed that the people were so dissatisfied with the rule of the Hudson's Bay Company that they would gladly receive Canadian rule. If the hon. member for Chateauguay had known beforehand that this was not the case, why had he not warned the Government. He might mention that even Governor MacTavish informed them that everything would be right, and that there would be no difficulty. As to the figures of the hon. member for Chateauguay, that hon. gentleman had shown that in the course of eight months something like half a million had been expended. Well only four months remained to be accounted for, and adding a proper proportion for this unexpired time, it would be seen that the expenditure would fall very far short of a million, especially when it was remembered that the first period included by far the heaviest expenditure.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal) referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Hants, and said that whoever might be the author of the articles in *Blackwood*, he was quite sure that Col. Wolesley was incapable of either writing or uttering anything which he knew to be false.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that if the member for Montreal would compare the remarks made by Col. Wolesley at the complimentary dinner in Montreal, with the statements made in the articles in *Blackwood*; he must come to the conclusion that, provided Col. Wolesley had written these articles, one of the statements was false.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) referred to the article in *Blackwood's Magazine*, condemning Col. Wolesley for having written it.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the Government had incurred the responsibility of their ignorance of affairs in the North West. They had the means of acquiring knowledge and having failed to take advantage of the opportunity afforded them, they deserved the whole blame.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL did not think there was ground for this charge of attempting to force on the North West a despotic system of government. With regard to the article which Col. Wolesley was charged with writing, he thought it would have been well for the hon. members of the Opposition to have refrained from making the statements they had

done, for it might turn out after all, that that gentleman was not the author. The article was certainly written in bad taste, and misrepresented the public men in Canada. So far as it related to himself (Hon. Mr. McDougall) he did not care, for military men coming from England here were disposed to snobbery in speaking of Canadians. Many of the charges against Canadian public men, however, were entirely unfounded, and so far as any of them were true they merely exposed disagreements which any Canadian going to England could see amongst the public men of the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN protested against the attempt of the Government to throw the responsibility of their bungling on the House.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the Government had done as well as could reasonably have been expected of them under the circumstances. The measure was only a temporary one and there was no disposition to over-ride the feeling and wishes of the people of Manitoba. The hon. member attempted to excuse the rebellion in Manitoba in his anxiety to throw all the blame on the Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that the hon. gentlemen opposite, by their Act of last session, giving the people of Manitoba responsible government, justified the people of that Province in their rebellion.

After some further discussion the item was carried.

The items under the head of "Customs," amounting to.....\$525,336 25
Inland Revenue..... 147,400 00
Post Office..... 858,000 00
Public Works..... 890,042 00
Minor Revenues..... 10,000 00

All the estimates with the exception of the Board of Works and Militia having been carried, the Committee rose and reported.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the second Reading of Bill [No. 54], an Act to indemnify the members of the Executive Government and others for the unavoidable expenditure of public money, in excess of the Parliamentary grant, incurred in repelling the threatened invasion of the Fenians in 1870.—Carried.

Third reading to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 11:35 p. m.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented a favorable report from the Committee on Stand-

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

ing Orders and Private Bills, respecting petitions from Molson's Bank; Merchant's Bank; Mechanic's Bank; Kingston Board of Trade; Corporation of Owen's Sound; Edward Blake and others; Edward Ryerson and others; Jacques Cartier Bank. On motion of Hon. Mr. Sanborn, the 51st rule respecting certain of the foregoing petitions was suspended.

CURRENCY.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN made the following enquiry:—"What expense has been incurred at St. John up to 1st March, 1871, in receiving, at the Treasury, uncurrent Nova Scotia Notes? What amount has been so received up to that date? Has such expense been borne by the Dominion or the Province of Nova Scotia, and whether the arrangement will be continued during the present year?"

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Government could not furnish the required information to the first of March, but would gladly do so to the first of January.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN agreed to amend the enquiry.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. MILLER then said—Have the Government come to any conclusion with regard to the course they intend to pursue with respect to the debate in the Senate on the resolutions providing for the admission of British Columbia into the Union.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied—The proposition which was made by my hon. friend from Wellington Division, in the Province of Quebec, and urged by other hon. gentlemen opposite, had the attentive consideration of the Government, especially of those who are members of this House. We are anxious, as I before said, to endeavour in every way to meet the wishes of the Senate by placing as much as possible within its original jurisdiction. We have, therefore, very carefully considered the proposition whether it be possible to forward the resolutions *pari passu* in each house; but we have found that this plan must be attended with great inconvenience. There were two ways by which we might bring up the question. One I mentioned when the matter was before the House the other day, and that was, as soon as the House of Commons had spoken upon the expenditure which the scheme would involve, then the resolutions might proceed *pari passu* in each branch. My hon. friend for Wellington Division, very properly observed that if the House of Commons pronounced on the subject, under such circumstances, there would be a full debate on the question, and it would necessarily come before us under considerable disadvantage.

Another plan would have been to eliminate from the resolutions all those parts which relate to the revenue; but that would have taken from the resolutions much of the interest that belongs to them, and deprived the members of the opportunity of referring to many important considerations connected with the question. This House is undoubtedly entitled to a full discussion of these resolutions as a whole. But I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that before we pronounce on them as a whole, we should have the entire case before us. In that phase, we might well include the opinion of the House of Commons on those clauses which affect the revenue. However much we might have it in our power to pronounce on the subject, the opinion of the other branch of the Legislature—especially charged with public expenditures, and directly responsible to the people—should have very great influence with members of this House and must necessarily form a very important element in the consideration of the whole question. I therefore feel, hon. gentlemen, that we cannot satisfactorily take up these resolutions or dispose of them until we have that information before us. Suppose the resolutions are taken up in this branch, and members actuated by feelings which are more likely to be found in a body which does not possess the enthusiasm of youth, or that sanguine temperament which may exist elsewhere, should arrive at the conclusion that the scheme was dangerous, that it involved a very great expenditure and that we were not prepared to assume such a responsibility, (hear, hear), and consequently should decide against the passage of these resolutions. When we had come to this decision we might be met by the news that the other branch of the Legislature had taken a different view—that it was more hopeful as to the future—that it saw this new territory peopled by thousands and bustling with enterprise and activity, and that there was no danger whatever in adopting the scheme. Then we would place this House in a position which any one anxious for its usefulness would not wish to see it in. Or suppose we arrived at a different conclusion—that it involved nothing hazardous, whilst the other branch of the Legislature pronounced a contrary opinion, we would be placed in a still more delicate position. As we are in most respects the branch of the Legislature before which schemes come in the second instance, as we are rather a body for the revision of schemes emanating in the other House, we cannot legitimately pass measures like this in the first place. Therefore, after the fullest consideration,

we have come to the conclusion that there is no way in which these resolutions can be passed *pari passu* in each House. I stated the other day that I sympathized with my hon. friend from the Wellington Division in his suggestion, for I feel, as he does, that when a question comes here after it has been fully discussed in the other House, it is divested of a good deal of its interest; but at the same time I cannot see my way clear in the present instance to pursue any other course than that I have pointed out.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.—I must call the attention of the Hon. Postmaster General to the fact that it would not be the first time we have discussed a question like the one under consideration. The resolutions respecting the union of all British America were first brought up in the Legislative Council of Canada by the late Sir Etienne Tache, and I cannot understand why there should be any difficulty now in the way of discussing a question of the same nature though of far less magnitude. Those resolutions were a sort of treaty between the Provinces—the resolutions in question will also be a *quasi* treaty between Canada and British Columbia. To say that this House shall be only the echo of the other branch of the Legislature is to denude it of all its powers and privileges. If we come to consider the legislation of this House, even during the present session, we find the Government itself has introduced and passed measures which have been objected to by the House of Commons. I refer to the measure to amend the Act respecting the protection of the fisheries. I cannot see why we cannot in all cases originate measures which touch the great interests of this country, and regret exceedingly to hear the explanation just made by the Postmaster General.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN—I contend that this is a question of policy—a power especially given to us by the Act of Confederation. We have a right, conjointly with the House of Commons, to pass resolutions, and we can also do so independently of that House. We have to take action just as if we knew nothing of their acts. The rule of Parliament which prevents this House initiating money appropriations, refers to those measures which pass each House and become law. The present, however, are resolutions in which we press on the Imperial Parliament the policy of adding another Province to the Dominion under the Act which makes provision for the annexation of another colony. I am very much afraid that the motives which induce the Government to come to this conclusion are not

such as would tend to make this body influential. If we are that venerable body of which the hon. member has spoken—if we have lost the sprightliness of youth it is certainly very unsatisfactory to discuss a great question like this when it has undergone the criticisms of such vigorous minds as obtain in the other House. It is said we are a revisory branch, but I am sure we cannot exercise our powers in this way with much energy or usefulness if we can only take up a subject when it is worn threadbare. The Postmaster-General says that we should meet this question as if it were something we should approve or disapprove of. That is not the case in my opinion. In respect to a Bill which comes from the other branch, we can exercise the revisory power; but when there is a joint address from each House there is no such power, for each body expresses an independent opinion; and, therefore, I cannot agree with the Postmaster-General as to the impropriety or inconvenience of these resolutions coming before us in the first instance. It is of very little consequence what the Senate says or does when the matter has been fully discussed elsewhere. If we wish to make our influence felt—to obtain a character for usefulness, we must make our opinions known. If we are supposed to possess that wisdom which age should have—if we possess that ability for arriving at a correct decision which we ought to have, than we should express an opinion independently, without reference to what has been done in another place. I very much fear that is not the object in bringing this question first in the House of Commons. It will only come before us when it is utterly impossible to do it justice or make our influence felt throughout the country. That is a good maxim—Age for Counsel; but our opportunities for making our usefulness evident are decidedly limited.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—I regret very much that the Government should have come to the conclusion that the resolutions in reference to British Columbia will not be introduced simultaneously in both Houses. I admit that the argument advanced by the Postmaster-General may be true theoretically, but practically I do not expect any such injurious results from the course we hoped would be followed. It appears to me that if this objection to the introduction of the resolutions was sound, the same would apply to any amendment which we might propose to make in the details of the measure. I remember, for instance, when a number of us who were opposed to the coal duties voted against the Tariff last session. If I remember aright, the hon.

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

Postmaster General urged very strongly that the question had been fully considered in the House of Commons, and that it was not for this House to oppose their decision on such a measure affecting the revenue. Therefore, when these resolutions come before the Senate, and objection is made to the railway proposition or other parts of the scheme, we may be told that we cannot legitimately alter or amend the details. Under these circumstances I very much regret that the Government have come to such a determination as that announced by the Postmaster General. I am sure that that hon. gentleman—who has always shown so deep an anxiety to support the dignity of this House—feels that we have reason to regret that the Senate cannot take up the question in the mode proposed.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—I must certainly say that I think it is advisable that the House should have more information before it, on particular points, in addition to that asked for by the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Hazen). For instance I have in my hand a return of the imports into the colony of British Columbia, in the year 1870. I presume this is intended to show us what revenue will probably accrue to the Dominion from the acquisition of the colony. It gives in the first column, the total quantities imported; in the second, the quantities entered for home consumption; in the third, the value of total imports; and in the last, the duty. We are not informed, however, as to the rates of duties, whether *ad valorem* or specific—or whether the amount in the last column, showing the duty, is collected on the total quantities imported, or on the quantities entered for home consumption. If the amount in the last column of duties be chargeable upon the total quantities imported, and not upon the quantities entered for home consumption, then it gives a fallacious idea of the actual amount of revenue, for a large amount may remain in bond. The total amount of the duty is about \$312,000, but I wish to know whether it is really upon the consumption or the Import of the colony.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I will make the necessary enquiry.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—If entered under the present tariff of the Dominion, the imports would yield a revenue of about \$258,000, or \$54,000 less than is now raised in British Columbia under its own tariff. In this return I find no reference whatever made to the excise which is levied in the country. Certainly we should have information on this point before us. According to Governor Musgrave,—his words are “at a moderate computation”—the Customs and

Excise duties are estimated for the year at \$850,000. It does strike me as very strange that there should be only \$300,000 from Customs and \$540,000 from Excise. It appears to me, therefore, we should look very closely into these matters before committing ourselves to a measure which will undoubtedly entail a great deal of expense (hear.) At the same time I differ from my hon. friends opposite, who are so anxious that this measure should be discussed simultaneously in each House. I approve entirely of the position which the Government has taken with regard to the mode of its discussion. The duty of this House is to revise the action of the Commons, and correct it when we see that errors have been committed. With respect to the argument used by the hon. member from Toronto,—that last year we were told we could not make any change in the Bill which imposed duties upon coal and other imports—I believe that it is not a case in point; for that was a Supply Bill, and it is distinctly laid down that following the rule in the House of Lords we cannot make any alteration in a Supply Bill, but must either accept or reject it as a whole.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—It was not a Supply Bill.

Hon. Mr. RYAN—I have always understood that a Tariff was most certainly a Supply Bill. I was, however, going on to say that it is our duty to revise the measures of the House of Commons, and there is no necessity for our being so anxious to get before the country. If we do our duty when the proper time comes, we shall obtain all the credit to which we are fairly entitled. It is unpleasant no doubt, for eloquent gentlemen not to have an opportunity of originating ideas, but I for one am not among those who have a desire to “ventilate my vocabulary,” to use a phrase once applied to an eminent but verbose statesman in England. This House should not go out of its proper sphere, but at the same time I feel that the Government should give us every information before we are called upon to decide a question of such importance as that to which the resolutions refer.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—If I understood the hon. Postmaster-General, he said that this was not a measure that we could alter.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—as I said that it was advisable that the House of Commons should first consider the question.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—This House has an inherent right to make changes and express an opinion simultaneously with the Commons. If this question is to be dealt with in the shape of a Bill then it must be introduced in one branch first, for you

cannot proceed simultaneously with a Bill. When it imposes a burthen on the people the proper place for its introduction would be, constitutionally, the other branch. But in cases like the present, when resolutions are introduced we have an equal right to express an opinion on them at the same time as the Commons. This House has also a right to make an amendment to them when they come from the other branch. This is a general measure affecting the policy of the country. Before it can operate there must be a joint address of both Houses. Each branch should have an opportunity of expressing its opinions with respect to the terms of that address. Under these circumstances, the matter might be brought first before this House. The Government have, however, defined the course they intend to pursue, and now the only way we can reach the question is by an hon. member moving the House into Committee on the Governor's Message, but that mode, I suppose, no one will assume the responsibility of pursuing.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—I do not intend to "ventilate my vocabulary," but as there appears to be some misapprehension with respects to some points, I may be allowed to make a few remarks. My hon. friend has stated that we are at liberty to alter any of the terms of the agreement. Now in the first place, I do not see any difficulty on parliamentary grounds, or reasons of convenience, in our originating this measure here or in the House of Commons, for our action is separate or independent. The 146th section of the Union Act says:—"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on an address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the Colonies or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, to admit those Colonies or Provinces, or any of them into the Union; and on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory, or either of them into the Union, on such terms and conditions as are in the addresses expressed, &c." I hold in the first place, and contrary to the opinions of some gentlemen, that we have no power to alter these laws, we must change them for better or worse. An address has been passed by the Legislature of British Columbia, and we must pass an address in similar terms or reject it—just as we may decide. It is because I consider this question is to be treated as an address, that I believe we might properly take it up in this House.

Hon. Mr. Botsford.

even before it is discussed in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON—I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether it is the intention of the Government to present the resolutions as a Treaty which cannot be amended or not. My own impression is that they will submit them as a Treaty as stated by my hon. friend from Nova Scotia—just as the resolutions respecting Confederation were presented. In that case, the rejection of one detail must be considered as a rejection of the whole. My opinion on this point is strengthened very much by telegrams which I find among the British Columbia papers:—

GOVERNOR MUSGRAVE TO GOVERNOR GENERAL
OF CANADA.

Received in OTTAWA, January 27th, 1871.

Legislature by resolution request me to seek consent of your Government to allow of our existing tariff during this season (?) by reducing duty on spirits to Canada rate, 80 cents, on flour, to 75 cents per barrel, on wheat, to 10 cents per bushel, so as to enter union with British Columbia tariff so altered. Aggregate revenue would not be less than under Canadian tariff. I recommend assent—telegraph reply.

[Signed,] A. MUSGRAVE

Vancouver Island, January 25, 1871.

TO GOVERNOR MUSGRAVE, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

OTTAWA, February 1, 1871.

The terms of union are in nature of a treaty. They have been extensively published in Canada, and accepted by British Columbia. The Canadian Government, therefore, think they have no right to alter those terms. After acceptance by Canada, Parliament may, in its discretion, modify the tariff on the request of British Columbia. I have no doubt that Parliament will consider any proposition made by you with a desire to meet your views as much as it properly can.

[Signed,] LISGAR.

Now, if it is the intention of the Government to present the measure as a treaty, which cannot be amended here in any of its details I cannot see why the discussion should not come off simultaneously, or even before it is taken up in the House of Commons. It is very much to be regretted that there is not more legislation initiated in this House. If that were the case this branch would become more useful and possess greater influence in the country.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is the intention of the Government to present the resolutions precisely in the same way as in the other branch—to ask this House to

make an address for which it will be immediately responsible. I cannot understand why there should be any mystery about this matter. Some gentlemen come here delegated by British Columbia to see on what terms a union with British Columbia can be accomplished. Those who occupy the position of Ministers of Crown, by favour of the people, arrange the terms of Union with these gentlemen who return home to hold an election to obtain the opinions of the people on the question. A legislature is elected and agrees to the terms of Union and passes an address proclaiming their desire to be annexed to Canada. It is now for this House to say whether a Union upon those terms will be beneficial or not. This House will exercise the responsibility of deciding this question when the proper time comes for making the address. We think it advisable first, however, to hear the opinions of the House of Commons on a measure of such importance. I do not say that the measure involves taxation, but it will involve, when carried out, a very serious burthen on the country, and before this House is in a position to pronounce on it, it is desirable to know the opinion of the other branch.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN—It does seem to me a monstrous proposition to ask this House to accept such terms as British Columbia, which does not enjoy responsible government at all, may choose to offer. If the hon. member will look over these papers he will see that Governor Mosgrave sends a petition from certain persons in Victoria, asking for some alterations in the terms. He tells them that the people of the colony have the best terms they can expect—in fact, better ones than they ought to have; but, nevertheless, he will send the memorial in hope of getting still more. Now, if we could change the scheme, and give British Columbia more, could we not also give less. I have no wish to discuss the question on so narrow a basis as seems allowable under the conditions laid down by the Government. As respects the hon. gentleman near me (Hon. Mr. Ryan), I must say he showed us very clearly the dangers of annexing British Columbia. I do not think there is any prospect of any of us being called upon too frequently “to ventilate our vocabulary,” judging by what has been done during this session.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN—The proposition before us is extremely simple. British Columbia offers to come into this Confederation on certain conditions; you may call them a treaty or bond as you like. The Government must ask Parliament to assent to the terms by a joint address from both houses. What follows then? Suppose

we adopt the address. The bond is made. Suppose we reject it. We tell British Columbia she must submit a different proposition. The Government have made this bargain but we cannot agree to it. Suppose both Houses agree, what then? An address goes to the Home Government asking that the Queen's proclamation be issued annexing British Columbia to the Confederation. In the mean time a Bill must pass the House of Commons to pay the large sums of money asked for under the terms. Therefore, if we pass the address, there must be also a Bill from the House of Commons. So far as the terms are concerned, I cannot see how British Columbia has “the cheek”—if that is a parliamentary expression [laughter] to ask so much, I never saw a more extraordinary proposition in my life. I think we should leave the gentlemen who passed Confederation to assume the whole responsibility of this transaction.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT—I am quite prepared to assume any responsibility so far as Confederation is concerned, but at the same time, I think we should have more information before us with respect to the exports and imports, the railway and other important details of the scheme.

SYNOD ACT.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved the suspension of the 60th rule in relation to the New Brunswick Synod Act.

Carried.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

In pursuance of the order of the day, The House went into Committee on the Bill to prevent corrupt practices in connection with the collection of the revenue.

Hon. Mr. WILSON in the chair.

Committee rose and reported Bill with amendment.

Third reading ordered for to-morrow.
The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1871.

RETURNS.

After routine.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY presented returns respecting the imports and exports of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN brought down returns relative to the bridge over the La-chine Canal at Montreal.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER presented a statement of the expenditures on account of Marine Police for 1870.

BANK INCORPORATION.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN introduced a Bill to incorporate the Farmers' Bank.

Mr. WORKMAN introduced an Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Bill (No. 32) An Act to establish one uniform currency for the Dominion of Canada, was read a third time.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the third reading of Bill No. 54, an Act to indemnify the members of the Executive Government and others for the unavoidable expenditure of public money, in excess of the Parliamentary grant, incurred in repelling the threatened invasion of the Fenians in 1870.

Mr. BAKER said at this stage of the Bill it might appear out of place to make any observations with respect to it, but he could not let the opportunity pass by without paying a liberal meed of praise to the Government for their prompt action in the emergency, and to the gallantry of the Volunteers in repelling the invaders. He spoke of the harmony which existed amongst the Volunteers throughout the entire trouble, and said the passage of this Bill without opposition was a just tribute to the Government for their patriotic energetic conduct. (Cheers.) The Bill was read a third time.

INLAND REVENUE.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the following resolutions:

1. That it is expedient to amend section 7, of the Inland Revenue Act, 1868, 31 Vic., c. 50, by providing that, paraffine wax in a solid state, grease for lubricating purposes and being fluid, lubricating oil made from crude petroleum without being subjected to any process of distillation, tar and other refuse removed from the still without passing through the worm or condenser, and any article produced from such tar or refuse without further process of distillation, shall be exempt from any duty of excise.

2. That it is expedient to amend section 29, of the Act 33 Vic. cap. 3, (To establish and provide for the Province of Manitoba), by authorising the Governor in Council to reduce any or all of the duties of excise, payable on the said Province during the period of three years from the passing of the said Act, under provisions of the laws of Canada respecting Inland Revenue, which he may see fit to declare applicable to the said Province, to such rates as he may deem expedient in view of the duties of customs payable during that period on like articles imported into the said Province.

The motion was carried and a Bill found-

Hon. Mr. Dunkin.

ed on the resolutions was introduced and read a first time.

SUPPLIES.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the reception of the Reports of the Committee of Supply. The items under the head of "Civil Government," "Administration of Justice," "Police," "Legislation," (including Senate, House of Commons, and miscellaneous) "Marine Hospitals," "Pensions," "New Militia Pension," and "Compensation to Pensioners," were received without discussion.

On the item of \$10,000 subsidy for steam communication between Halifax and St. John via Yarmouth,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON repeated the objection which he had made to it in Committee of Supply. He did not approve of subsidizing one steamer, thus giving it an advantage over all competitors.

Hon. JOSEPH HOWE said that the Local Government had for years been endeavouring to establish this Bill. The country required it, and it could not be had without a subsidy.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD was opposed to the vote, not because it was proposed to expend it in Nova Scotia, but because he had always been opposed to the principle of subsidizing local steamers.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he was not surprised at the manner in which this, as all other appropriations for Nova Scotia, was received by certain hon. gentlemen from Ontario in this House. When Nova Scotia consented to give up her revenue in order to enter the Confederation, it was on condition that certain services borne by the Local Government should be chargeable to the Dominion Government. Hon. members opposite knew the difficulty to reduce the amount of subsidy or to base it on population, and how Nova Scotia and New Brunswick pared down their expenses in order to make Confederation possible at all. Under this system, Ontario was left with a surplus of millions of dollars, while Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were in a comparatively inferior and poorer position. He would say to hon. gentlemen from Ontario who approached every appropriation for local services in the Maritime Provinces in such a niggardly spirit that it was a similar spirit which had almost rent old Canada apart, and that they owed to Nova Scotia the removal of that cause of complaint and barrier to its progress. Looking at that fact, it ill became hon. members from Ontario to approach these appropriations to Nova Scotia in such an unfair spirit. When she had a revenue of her own, she provided for those local services, thus embracing the trade of the country and increasing the revenue. When

the representatives came to this House, they asked for such small assistance as would foster and develop that trade and increase the prosperity of the country. This Government felt that it was right to make such an appropriation, and in the first estimate, it was submitted to this Parliament and was granted. It was found to be insufficient for the purpose and was not expended in consequence. The service could now be performed for \$10,000 and Nova Scotia asked for a re-vote of the unexpended sum. In order to have the service accomplished at all a subsidy was required, and if ever there was a good claim for Government assistance it was in this case.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) said the President of the Council had charged the Ontario members, very unfairly, with opposing every appropriation asked for by the Government to be expended in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER explained that he did not charge all the Ontario representatives with the injustice. It was only some of them in the Opposition, claiming to be leaders of liberal opinions, who had in such matters shown a most illiberal spirit, indeed (hear).

Mr. JONES said he was glad to hear the hon. member's explanation. He (Mr. Jones) was opposed to the vote because he did not believe in the principle of subsidizing steamers, whether in Nova Scotia, Ontario or any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) objected to the grounds on which the President of the Council had supported the vote, that it was due to Nova Scotia in consequence of other grants given to Ontario. He (Mr. Jones) advocated it as a public necessity, and as a measure which would afford accommodation to the people of Nova Scotia. The item was one in which the people of the whole Dominion were interested—and was a simple measure of justice.

Mr. LAWSON, referring to the remarks of the President of the Council maintained that Ontario owed nothing more to Nova Scotia than it did to other Provinces. As long as Nova Scotia only required justice, they would get it, which they could not otherwise obtain, and on the ground of justice, he should vote for the grant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) thought the President of the Council had failed in his endeavour to fasten on the members of the Opposition a desire to deal unjustly with Nova Scotia. The proposal was to grant a subsidy to a vessel engaged in the coasting trade of Nova Scotia, and not to grant any portion to the vessel connecting with New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said the money was to be placed at the disposal of the Postmaster General to enable him to complete the communication between the two Provinces, including the Western parts of the Southern shore.

Mr. MILLS referred to the understanding which he said existed at the commencement of Confederation to encourage the various Provinces to rely on their own resources for local improvements, and to confine to the Dominion Government those great works that were of national importance. The work in question was purely local. He considered that before Government aid could be asked, it was necessary to shew that there was a necessity for such aid, which certainly had not yet been done.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he would not go into the question of locality, but would treat the matter entirely on its merits, and on the principle it involved. The constitution itself provided that lines of steamships, &c., connecting the different Provinces should come within the power of the Dominion. The same principle had been recognized by every Province before Confederation, and he instanced cases in which similar lines had been aided by each Province concerned. The present line of communication had been assisted by the Local Government before Confederation, but since then it had been considered that the Dominion Government was the proper party to afford that aid. Therefore as the principle had been recognized for twenty years, and was clearly laid down in the constitution, the vote could not be opposed on that account.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether fixed rates would be insisted on in this case.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that would be a matter for consideration.

Mr. MILLS referred to the clause of the constitution providing that lines of steamships, &c., not connecting one Province with another were to be dealt with by the Local Governments, and stated that the connection with St. John had simply been tacked on to bring the matter within the rule of the Dominion Government.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg) said that the fact of hon. gentlemen closing their eyes to the necessity of this work did not do away with the necessity. It was quite clear that the money was to be voted for a steam service between Halifax and St. John, touching at intermediate points, and whether that service was performed by one boat or more was of no consequence. It had been stated that one portion of the line was already provided for, but of what use was that until the other part was provided for, and to do this

the aid of the Dominion Government was necessary. The principle was recognized by all the Provinces and could not be questioned. There was equally little room for disputing the fact of the service being interprovincial. He had heard a good deal lately of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House of treating such votes on their merits, and many professions had been made by them of good will to the Maritime Provinces, but he thought it unfortunate that their good will ended in theory without ever extending into practice, for whenever a proposal came before the House having for its object the advantage of the Lower Provinces, unless the people of the larger Province were to receive some direct and tangible benefit, nothing was heard of the sympathy of those gentlemen. The people of Nova Scotia were beginning to understand that kind of sympathy well, and to estimate it at its proper value, for whenever sectional feelings had been introduced into any discussion he believed it could invariably be traced to the members of the Opposition from Ontario.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that there was something else that the people of Nova Scotia would soon begin to understand, besides what had been referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg, they would begin to appreciate at its true value the apostasy of the representatives whom they had sent for a particular purpose, but who had become the most supple tools of the Government.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg) — To whom does the hon. gentleman refer?

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—He referred to a number of the members of Nova Scotia, and notably to the hon. member for Lunenburg, and the position he now occupied, as compared with the position he occupied three years ago. He then came to that House and tried to secure the sympathy and assistance of the Opposition, which he had now denounced and misrepresented. The people of Nova Scotia would learn how to appreciate those members who were sent up in opposition to the Government of which they were to-day the most obedient and the most thorough-paced supporters, and who were no doubt made such by similar votes to the very one now before the House.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg) would have called the hon. gentleman to order, had he not desired that he should conclude, so that he (Mr. McDONALD) might reply on the spot. The honourable member had entirely misrepresented the position in which he stood when he first entered the House, and his present position. He had never occupied the position ascribed to him, and the hon. member for

Chateauguay in the statement he had made, had gone beyond the rules of the House in stating what was utterly without foundation. He (Mr. McDONALD) held documents which would disprove in the clearest way, the slanderous statements made by that hon. gentleman. When sent by his constituents to that house, he was sent, not to take the position ascribed to him, but to use his best efforts to procure a repeal of the Union with Canada, and, failing that, to procure such a modification of the scheme of Confederation as would make it more equitable and just to Nova Scotia. Such was the written record on which he stood, and he would ask the hon. member for Chateauguay whether there was in that anything inconsistent with his present position. In the first session he felt that he could not take sides with either party until the question of repeal was fairly tried out, and when it was found that repeal could not be obtained, and that the gentlemen forming the Opposition, equally with the supporters of the Government, were determined that Nova Scotia should not leave the Union, and that England also decided that the Union should be maintained, it was then his duty and that of the other representatives of Nova Scotia to decide with which party they should associate themselves, which party was actuated by the highest motives, and governed by the truest principles, and exhibited the best inclinations to promote the interests of the country, and it did not take them very long to decide, for when they found a disposition on the part of the Government to listen to any reasonable and just proposition, and on the other side a carping, sectional, illiberal opposition, that never looked at anything, but from an Ontario point of view, they at once saw that they were not justified in associating themselves with that Opposition. When, therefore, the hon. gentleman from Chateauguay next tried to attack him, let him be sure that he did not substitute fiction for fact, and let him be quite sure that his own record was such as would bear investigation.

Dr. FORBES (Queen's, N. S.) spoke of the isolated position of his constituency, and the other portions of the Province to be benefited by the proposed line of communication and maintained the necessity of the vote. Their only means of communication at present were old fashioned sailing boats, and as the undertaking was most certainly interprovincial in its character, it was only just that the Dominion Government should grant a subsidy.

Hon. Mr. BOLTON (Charlotte) said that as the Government had decided that a steamer traversing the coasts of a Province, but connecting with another vessel

Mr. McDonald.

which proceeded to another Province, was entitled to a Government subsidy, he had submitted to the Council a petition for a subsidy for a similar undertaking in New Brunswick, and he should not therefore oppose the item under discussion, but should expect similar treatment for the case he had submitted.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought they were entitled to hear something from the Minister of Finance on the subject.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that no doubt the Finance Minister would be very willing to express himself on the subject, but before he did so, he (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) would like to say a few words in reference to what had fallen from the hon. member for Chateaugay. Every one acknowledged that in matters concerning the rules of the House, that hon. gentleman was somewhat of an authority, but he (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) thought he should not limit himself to the theory, but should conform to the rules in practice. His hon. friend had risen from his seat, and with great warmth had said that Nova Scotia would know how to appreciate the political apostasy of the hon. member for Lunenburg and others of her representatives. The member for Lunenburg had very properly replied to that charge, but he (Sir George E.) desired to remind the hon. gentleman from Chateaugay that he should be the last to call any member an apostate. He then referred to the time when they were both ardent supporters of the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, when all of a sudden the member for Chateaugay had (he did not like to say apostacised) left that Government. He thought the hon. gentleman should look back on his own past before making a charge of this kind. As to the position of the representatives of Nova Scotia, it was true that the majority had at first come to seek repeal, or, failing that, to obtain better terms. The measure passed by the Parliament of Canada, however, had satisfied them, and the majority now supported the Government. He then referred to the elections at Colchester, Cumberland, Hants, and Kings, and also to the election for the Local Legislature at Halifax, as showing how completely the different constituencies had justified the position taken by their representatives. He trusted the hon. member for Chateaugay would see that he had gone out of his way in calling any of these gentlemen political apostates.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON referred to the counter-charge brought against him, and maintained that in not continuing to support the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, he could in no degree be charged with

political apostasy. When, in 1854, there had been a rupture in the ranks of the Liberal party of Lower Canada, he had followed his usual instincts in taking his stand with the more advanced wing of the party, and had continued to act with that party ever since.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that the reason he had not spoken was that he thought there had been quite enough discussion, but not from any hesitation to defend the estimates. He could say distinctly that he had never been opposed to the principle of granting subsidies. He might have objected in individual cases, but never to the principle. He understood the hon. member for Chateaugay to describe the Baldwin and Lafontaine Ministry, as reactionary at the later period referred to. The Government that succeeded them were more advanced on questions in which that gentleman took a special interest, such as the Clergy Reserves, than their predecessors. He believed, the general impression as to that Ministry was, that they showed a tendency to progress in a manner perhaps agreeable to the member for Chateaugay, but not in a manner consistent with sound constitutional principles. He was prepared to defend this item under consideration.

Mr. JONES, of Halifax, referred to statements of previous speakers, including the President of the Council, who had stated he had been returned to support the Government by nearly as large a majority as in 1867. When the result of the Halifax election was ascertained, the partizanship and irregularities were found so startling as to demand the attention of a Committee of this House. He believed the upshot would be a gain to his party. When they looked at the whole situation, and the recent elections in Nova Scotia, they would perceive the people might have, to some extent, become demoralised or indifferent to public questions, but that the same feeling has ever existed; and if there was to-day an opportunity of securing release from the present connection, they would as unanimously as in 1867, vote for that deliverance. (Hear, hear, and counter cheers.) But it was because they believed there was no outlet, they appeared divided, and because expectations in regard to some had been disappointed, that distrust had arisen.

The SPEAKER said he must call the attention of the member for Halifax to the fact that he was out of order.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he hoped the member for Halifax would be allowed to proceed as after the statements he had made he could allow his speech to go unanswered.

Hon. Dr. BLANCHET moved an adjournment.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he was obliged to his hon. friend for affording him the opportunity on the instant to reply to the gross misstatements of the hon. member for Halifax, as they were calculated, as he believed they were intended, to injure the country where the member who had made them was not known. The member for Halifax notwithstanding all that had taken place, had had the audacity to declare that the hostility of Nova Scotia to the Union was as great at this moment as in 1867. He had ventured the assertion that he (Dr. Tupper) had secured his election by a speech on nomination day, pledging payment to Railway claims, although he well knew that for a month previous to that speech, all the efforts of the member for Halifax and those who acted with him, were fruitless to get up an opposition. He could tell the hon. member that it was not because he endorsed the written opinion of over eighty of the independent members on both sides of that House, respecting the payment of those claims that Cumberland, one of the most intelligent counties in Nova Scotia, had by acclamation returned him to his seat in the Government, and in that House. No man had contributed more to the change of sentiment in Nova Scotia than the member for Halifax, who, at a public meeting, called by the citizens of that city for the purpose of arranging a fitting reception to the Queen's representative, declared that "when the British flag was handed down on the Citadel Hill, he would take off his hat and cheer." It is too late for the hon. member to deny his utterances in the presence of hundreds of witnesses—utterances so disloyal that the venerable Judges of the Superior Court were compelled with disgust to leave the room. It was when the people of Nova Scotia found that disloyal and annexationist designs animated the member for Halifax, and that his hostility to union was caused by his determination to overthrow British Institutions, that all parties and classes had united to sustain the policy by devoting their best energies to the successful working out of the great question of Confederation. Let us examine the daring misstatement of the hon. member for Halifax in the light of facts which are now matter of history. When my hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Provinces found that the union could not be repealed he respected the pledge which he and his friends had given to obtain the best terms they could for Nova Scotia, they were met in a gracious spirit by this

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

Government and Parliament, and arrangements were made which have received the hearty approval of that Province. When my hon. colleague asked the approval of his constituents of the course he had considered it his duty to take, the county of Hants returned him to the seat he had occupied in this Government by an overwhelming majority, although the member for Halifax had hounded him all over the county at an inclement season of the year in the hope that his greater physical vigour would destroy my hon. colleague. Next came the county of Colchester, where Mr. Archibald, one of the Union delegates who had in 1867, been defeated by a majority of 400 was returned by a majority nearly as great as an ardent supporter of the Union and of this Government, and when he was called to fill the high office of Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, the present member defeated an anti-unionist candidate, one of the local members for that county of the Jones annexationist stamp, by an immense majority. In Cumberland, where at the election of 1867, I had great difficulty to secure a seat at all, all parties united in returning me last summer by acclamation as a member of this Government. The hon. member who now so ably represents the county of Kings has told you from his place in this House that he comes here engaged to work for the good of the country. At the recent election in Halifax the hon. member put it broadly to the electors that the issue was Union and that if they elected our friend Mr. Hill it would prove their confidence in Mr. Howe and myself, yet, notwithstanding the most determined exertions of the member for Halifax the constituency who had defeated Mr. Hill by hundreds three years ago, elected him as their representative. Had the hon. member for Halifax the spirit for which I gave him credit he would have placed his seat in their hands the moment he was thus told by them who had sent him there that they no longer required his services. The member for Halifax claimed credit for the saving of public money he had effected by absenting himself from this House for two sessions, and was told by the people of Halifax that they agreed with him that his services were not worth the money, and that the sooner he gave his constituents an opportunity of being properly represented the more gratified they would feel. Instead, however, of bowing to the verdict of his constituents the hon. member comes here after being told that he was not wanted, and as if to urge himself upon them joins in a vote of want of confidence moved by an hon. member who specially denounced the ap-

propriation of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to extend the railway into the heart of the city of Halifax. In conclusion he (Dr. Tupper) said he would not have noticed the remarks of the hon. gentleman who so misrepresented the people of Nova Scotia, had he not felt satisfied that his attempt to deny the fact that Nova Scotia was now prepared to heartily co-operate with all the other portions of this Dominion in building up a great and prosperous Confederation, had been deliberately made with a view to inflict a deep injury upon their own country at a critical and important period.

Mr. JONES replied that the hon. gentleman's eloquence was designed to carry people's attention from the fact that he could not defend the present item, or his proved incapacity in forming this union with Canada. He had been obliged to confess in this House that he had been so unequal to the position he occupied, and knew so little about the circumstances, wants and position of Nova Scotia—about the public accounts—that he had allowed the delegates from the other provinces to make a bargain that had placed the revenue of the country entirely in their hands, and given them large surpluses, whilst his countrymen were left in a condition of bankruptcy. He challenged that Minister to go down there and make that speech. His first scheme left Nova Scotia with \$400,000 less than she received to-day; and if anything was wanted to prove his incapacity, his own speech had furnished it [hear, hear]. He had misrepresented his speech at Halifax in regard to the welcome of the Governor General. (The hon. gentleman here read an extract of his speech touching His Excellency's remark, as to the future of Canada, to the effect that if Britain desired us to assume an independent position, desired to withdraw her troops and haul down her flag, he had enough confidence in the people to feel sure they would accept that policy cheerfully, and in so doing they would receive his candid acquiescence.) Was there treason in these remarks (cheers)? Instead of his being an annexationist, as charged, he had, when the revulsion of feeling following the defeat of the efforts at repeal took place in Nova Scotia, day after day resisted the appeals of his friends to adopt that policy [hear, hear]. He therefore hurled back that accusation, which was as unfounded as the others levelled at him. As to the observation that, since the election of Mr. Garvie for Halifax county, he should resign his seat, as condemned by the people. Did the member for Cumberland resign his seat in 1867, when a Repealer was elected side by side with him [cheers)?

No; he came here and afterwards went on a Government mission. He was not afraid to meet that gentleman in Nova Scotia on every occasion, because it was known he went into politics for principle, and endeavored to act consistently with his own convictions and the feelings of his constituents. If he had known how to discharge his duty, to Nova Scotia no grievances would have arisen, and the Province would have stood in a very different position [cheers]. He believed that, if it were possible to relieve Nova Scotia from the Union, as large a vote for repeal could be secured to-day as was obtained in 1867.

The motion for adjournment was withdrawn, and it being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Concurrence in the Report of the Committee of Supply was resumed.

The remaining items under the head of "Ocean and River Steam Packet Service," were carried.

On the item \$5000 for Meteorological Observatories including instruments,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER explained that the object of the grant was to obtain correct reports of meteorological changes, in order to apply them to practical use.

Mr. MILLS believed that this work could better be done by scientific men than by Government. The Ministers should also furnish details as to how the money was to be expended.

After some further discussion the item with all others under the head of "Geological Survey and Observatories" was carried.

On the items under the head of "Arts, Agriculture and Statistics,"

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN moved that the item of \$360,000 for taking the census be reduced to \$260,000.—Carried.

The items under the head of "Immigration and Quarantine" were carried.

The following items were carried without discussion; "Penitentiaries," "Light-house and coast service," "Fisheries."

In reply to Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL, Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that the \$70,000 for giving additional protection to the Fisheries, would not be expended if the Joint High Commission should be able to settle the fisheries difficulty satisfactorily.

Votes for "Culling Timber," "Steam boat inspection," "Indians" and several items under the head of "Miscellaneous" were carried without discussion.

On the item of \$50,000 for one half of the British share of the expenditure in reference to the surveys of the boundary

line between Canada and the United States,

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL wished to know if any portion of that sum was to be devoted to determining the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was a clause in the Manitoba Act now before the Imperial Government by which, at any time difficulty should arise between the two Provinces the line could be surveyed.

Mr. BLAKE said that the Legislature of Ontario had voted \$15,000 with the expectation that the Dominion Government would also vote a sum for the same purpose. He recommended the Finance Minister to place such a vote in the supplementary estimates.

After some further discussion the item was carried.

On the item, \$400,000, for opening up communication with the North West,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that the estimate for military expenses should be kept separate from the grant for opening up communication with Manitoba. It was hardly fair to ask the House to vote this large sum *en bloc*. It was irregular, to say the least. Last year it was advisable under the exceptional circumstances, but there was no excuse for it this year.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said if the House desired it he would bring down details of the military expenses.

The item was carried.

On the item of \$68,812.75 to provide for the collection of Customs in the Province of New Brunswick,

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN called attention to the increase in the amount of the estimate over the vote of last year. He observed that the increase was principally in the Port of St. John.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said this was an annual complaint of the hon. member for Gloucester.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN—So is the increase.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the increase had been caused by the improved system of collection which had been adopted. The change had been made in the interests of commercial men and the public generally. He mentioned the particular instances in which increase had been made.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON preferred the annual offering of the member for Gloucester rather than that of the Minister of Customs. He referred to the increase at the Port of St. Johns, amounting to \$7,000.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY explained that a number of officers had been added to the per-

manent list in order to bring them under the Civil Service Act—who had not been included in last years estimate.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN maintained that, admitting what had been said, the expenditure now was much larger than it had been formerly, although the revenue collected was smaller. He referred to the acquisition of a Custom House at St. John, notwithstanding which the amount expended for rent was as large as formerly. Since 1st July 1867 the expenditure had increased fifty per cent.

Mr. BOLTON (Charlotte) did not think the increase had been explained away.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that on examination it would be found that the most rigid economy had been exercised in the matter.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal) thought that instead of grumbling at increases, there ought rather to be a still larger expenditure, for he knew of many instances in Montreal in which the officers received the most inadequate remuneration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) referred to the change made to bring officers within the compass of the Civil Service Act.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY had intended to carry the Superannuation Act. The officers had previously received a daily part, but were now included at an annual salary.

Hon. Mr. HOWE spoke of the inadequate salaries paid to public servants generally, and referred particularly to the Chief Customs Official at Halifax.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that the average salary to be paid to Collectors amounted to \$369.

There had been a vast increase of work which required increased expenditure.

Mr. OLIVER asked an explanation of the opening of three new ports of Entry in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the expense of collection in Ontario had been reduced, and he was not aware of any new offices.

Items for Customs carried.

INLAND REVENUE ITEMS.

Mr. HOLTON asked for full and particular explanation of the enormous increase in expenditure as compared with the year 1867.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the amount asked was very small, considering the service performed, and its peculiar character, and great variety. The work had increased excessively. He compared the amount collected and the amount expended for

Hon. Mr. Dunkin.

the years since Confederation. He submitted that there were few Government services performed at so low an expense—and the salaries paid were exceedingly inadequate. The expenditure had increased in proportion to the work done.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had hoped that the Minister of Inland Revenue, would have descended from generalities to particulars of facts and figures. All he had said was that the work was increasing, but no statement of figures was vouchsafed.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that while the Revenue had increased twenty per cent., the cost of collection had increased seventy per cent.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS thought the statement made ought to be satisfactory. Full particulars of the whole matter were before the House.

Items passed.

POST OFFICE ITEMS.

Mr. OLIVER referred to the salaries paid to Postmasters, which he considered excessive.

Items carried.

PUBLIC WORKS ITEMS.

Mr. BOLTON (Charlotte) referred to the amount asked for the Nova Scotia railways, which was more than the whole amount earned the year before. The railways seemed to be sinking money every year.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN was glad to be able to supply the information asked for. He compared the amounts received and expended on account of the railways of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The reason why the Nova Scotia railways cost more for maintenance than those of New Brunswick was that there was a greater length of line in operation, and consequently a greater amount of work. He gave particulars of the length of line in operation, and the miles run by locomotives and cars, and the cost of maintenance of way. A great reason of the larger expenditure required by the Nova Scotia railways was the large amount required for renewal. He read a report of the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway to the effect that the construction of the Nova Scotia railways had been in the first instance very defective, and that the work was of a much more difficult nature than in the case of the railways in New Brunswick. This would explain the large expenditure on the Nova Scotia railways.

M. BOLTON thought there had never been a more extraordinary excuse for the expenditure of money. The present dif-

ference of length was five miles, while the difference of expenditure according to the estimates was \$100,000. The Minister of Public Works had not explained the necessity for increasing the estimates for working expenses. There had been a loss of over \$30,000 on the roads during the last year.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said every one knew how much easier the New Brunswick lines were of construction than those of Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia Railways had also been longer in operation than those of New Brunswick.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON did not speak of the cost of construction, but the working expenses—which had absorbed the gross earnings.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN thought the explanation of the Minister of Public Works reflected very strongly on those who had charge of the construction of the Nova Scotia Railway. The question, however, was on the working expenses, and the accounts showed that a loss had occurred last year of \$32,000. He hoped if this was not correct, the Minister of Public Works would lay the real state of the case before the public.

Mr. McDONALD (Glengary) spoke of the wretchedly bad construction of a portion of the road in Nova Scotia, and anticipated a large yearly expenditure to keep the road in order. The rolling stock also required repair.

Items carried, and the resolutions were reported.

Items for Minor Revenues carried.

OAKVILLE HARBOUR.

On motion of Sir F. HINCKS the House went into Committee to consider a Resolution declaring it expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to sell, on such terms as may seem fit, Oakville Harbor with the tolls and all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining.

Resolution concurred in, report received, resolution read a second time, a Bill introduced—to be read a second time to-morrow.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

On motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the House went into Committee to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to amend the Acts respecting Insurance Companies.

Resolution adopted, report received and Bill introduced, to be read a second time to-morrow.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice

that he would introduce the Bill for the admission of British Columbia on Friday next.

The House adjourned at 11:40.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Immediately on the doors being opened,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said—Before the House proceeds to business I desire to refer to a painful circumstance which I am sure everyone is already aware of, that a very severe affliction has overtaken the Speaker of this House and his family. I am confident I express the sympathy which prevails in the minds of every hon. gentleman present, and I think we should offer the Speaker every opportunity of uniting with his family in paying that tribute of respect which he must wish to pay under the circumstances. Before making the motion I intend to offer, I beg to inform hon. gentlemen that I have made myself acquainted with the fact that the public business will not suffer by a short adjournment I have learned that no measures of importance are likely to come up between to-day and the time I propose that the House shall adjourn to. Such being the case, I trust that the Senate will agree to the motion which I now make, that when the House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday evening next at half past seven o'clock.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST seconded the motion, and said that the speaker had assuredly the sympathy of the House in his sad bereavement.

The House then adjourned on motion of Hon. Mr. Campbell.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1871.

VOTE BY BALLOT.

After routine,
Mr. TREMBLAY introduced a Bill to provide for voting by ballot.

SUN INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. WORKMAN introduced a Bill to amend the Act of Incorporation of the Sun Insurance Company of Montreal.

The Speaker.

PORT WARDEN, QUEBEC.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Friday next, to consider certain resolutions providing for the appointment of a Port Warden, for the Harbour of Quebec, &c. He explained that he wished to give to the city of Quebec, a system similar to that which now prevailed in Montreal, and which had been found to work exceedingly well.

The motion was carried.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that on Friday next, the House be resolved into Committee of the Whole, to amend the Act providing for the settlement of the affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada. He explained that the object of this measure was to give the Government power to make advances from the Consolidated Fund, on most undoubted securities, viz.: mortgages at seven per cent. interest, to enable them to pay off a small number of creditors of the Bank. He would give further explanations on moving the House into Committee.

The motion was carried.

LOAN WITH IMPERIAL GUARANTEE.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House do on Friday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:

"That it is expedient to provide, that the loan of one million four hundred and sixty thousand dollars, or three hundred thousand pounds sterling, raised in England, with the guarantee of the Imperial Government for the payment of the interest thereon, under the authority of the Act of Canada, 32 and 33 Vic., Cap. 1, for the purpose of paying a like sum to the Hudson's Bay Company, for the purposes set forth in the said Act,—be made the next charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, after any charge thereon created or to be created thereon, under the Act of Canada passed in the 31st year of Her Majesty's Reign, Chapter 41, for any loan for fortifications; and that further provision be made with respect to the loan first above mentioned in conformity to the requirements of the Act of the Imperial Parliament, 32 and 33 Vic. Cap. 101, under which the guarantee of the Imperial Government was given for the payment of the interest on the said loan.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked if the money had been raised.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said it was practically out of the hands of the Imperial Government and this Parliament was re-

quired to pass an Act, to bring it under the Consolidated Fund of Canada.

The motion was carried.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition from Mr. Waddington and others, respecting the construction of a Pacific Railway.

CUSTOMS ACT.

The Act to amend the Act relating to duties of Customs was read a second time and passed through Committee of the Whole.

On the motion for a third reading of the Bill to-morrow,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved in amendment that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole forthwith, for the purpose of so amending the same as to repeal the duties on coal, coke, flour and wheat.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said this was a most inopportune time to bring up this motion while the Joint High Commission was in session. Of course it was impossible to say what that body was discussing, but it was highly probable that they were dealing with this question. He hoped, therefore, that this motion would not be pressed until the result of the Commission should be made known.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was evident that the Government had given up the measure on its merits, and could only plead for delay. The question was whether in the light of the past it was advisable to retain these duties or not. He believed that no good reason could be urged for the tax, and he therefore would press his motion.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS wished to explain that his only reason for not discussing the question on its merits was because he considered that it was quite unnecessary and wholly out of place to do so just at present.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said these duties had already conferred great benefits on Canada, especially on Nova Scotia and Ontario. The Joint High Commission was no doubt discussing this as well as other questions affecting this country, and this country could afford to wait a while before repealing this duty. Already the United States Government had repealed their duty on coal.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that they were induced to do so, through no action on the part of the Dominion, but simply because they wished to repeal an absurd duty.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said never-

theless the action of the Dominion Government had been referred to in the debate in Congress, although he did not suppose that it had influenced the American Government to any extent.

Mr. WORKMAN said this duty had caused a great deal of trouble and had brought no commensurate return to the country. He did not approve of giving so much power to the Government. It was a dangerous power to give to them, and might be used for dangerous purposes. Let Parliament deal with the question in the usual way. He referred to the action of the American Government in remitting the duty on coal, and said it was absurd to suppose that any action of our Government had influenced them to do so.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that the Northern Transportation Co. had addressed the Canadian Government asking them why they had placed this oppressive duty on their vessels. The answer returned was that Canada had placed no higher duties on American products than the United States had on those from Canada. Similar communications had been read from other American companies, and the fact was that it had brought our neighbors to see that it was necessary to treat Canada liberally if they would themselves be dealt with in a similar manner.

Mr. MAGILL spoke in favour of the amendment and trusted that the Ministry would consent to the renewal of the duties on coal.

Mr. BEATY was opposed to the tax upon coal. It could not be defended. It was unjust because it was unequal in its operation. It pressed heavily on Ontario while other Provinces were not injured by it. He hoped it would be repealed, for he believed coal should be placed at the lowest possible price, and within the reach of the poor. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. OLIVER quite agreed with the hon. member for East Toronto. The coal tax was a grievous burden on Ontario, as the duty on flour was to the people of the Maritime Provinces. He hoped this tax on the necessities of life would be repealed.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER did not think that too great importance could be attached to the injury which could not fail to arise from the discussion on this motion. Still, he thought even greater injury might be brought on this country if the statements made during this discussion were allowed to pass unchallenged. When this measure was introduced last year, it was objected to on the ground that it would provoke retaliation on the part of the American Government. But it had not been attended by any of the results that were feared

by hon. members opposite. He would remind those who said that the duty on coal in the United States had not been repealed through the course pursued by this Government, that although efforts had frequently been made to remove the tax, it had not succeeded until the Canadian Government imposed the duty on coal and flour. If the action of the American Government was not *propter hoc*, it was, at least *post hoc*. He referred to the effect of the coal tax, and said that the trade in coal in Nova Scotia had increased one-sixth since the imposition of the duty. The export to Ontario and Quebec had increased within the same period fifty per cent. The increased competition had so cheapened the article that it had not added a cent to the cost of it to the people.

Mr. WORKMAN—Does the hon. member mean to say that coal is not dearer in Canada now than it was before?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it had shown the Pennsylvania monopolists that Canada was independent of them. No one could question the soundness of the policy which had by the imposition of this trivial tax, relieved this country from the power of the coal miners of Pennsylvania. The action of Congress went to prove that a wiser and more politic course had never been taken, and this had been done without, in the slightest degree, oppressing the people of the Dominion. The hon. member for North Oxford had undertaken to shew that the imposition of the duty on flour was of no value whatever to the producers of Ontario, and that at the same time it had largely increased the cost of flour in the Maritime Provinces. That increased cost had arisen from exceptional circumstances, however, and there had certainly been an amount of benefit to the producer. The House had decided when the duties were imposed that the Policy was judicious. Referring to the protection of the Fisheries, that protection had in a single year fostered and stimulated two great staple interests of the Dominion, the Fishing and the Shipping Interests, which had attained an amount of success unparalleled hitherto, and the fishermen had been enabled, notwithstanding the enormous duties imposed by the United States, to compete in the American markets. The result had been that the highest executive authority in the United States had drawn the attention of the Parliament of that country to the great importance to them of obtaining the enjoyment of the Canadian Fisheries. Knowing, however, the indefeasible right of Canada to her Fisheries, and knowing her determination and that of England,

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

to protect them, it was well understood by the Americans that they would not be able to gain access to the Fisheries without an equivalent. Of course, nothing was known of the action or intention of the High Commission at Washington, but he would ask the House, including those who had been most forward in opposing the whole protective policy from its initiation, at the present crisis, and in view of the possible action of the High Commission not to do anything, either by disension or even discussion that might weaken the hands of the representative of Canada, in obtaining terms which he could not obtain otherwise—even if it had not been proved that the Policy was wise and judicious, even if the reverse had been shown, was it just that the House should take away from Canada's representative, the power to offer any return to the advantages America might offer to concede? He asked that the question should be dealt with as it affected the interests of the whole Dominion, and that nothing should be done which might induce the Americans to entertain the mistaken impression that Canada's future prosperity was dependent on the policy of the United States.

Mr. WORKMAN said that anthracite coal must be imported from the United States, and consequently this duty did increase the cost of it.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT did not think that the Hon. President of the council had any provocation for taking the House to task in the manner which he had just done. While several hon. members had spoken against the duty, none excepting members of the Government had attempted to say one word in favor of it. In reply to his hon. friends argument that this system would foster the coal interest in Canada, and give cheap fuel to the people, he would simply point to the effect of the same policy in the United States. There it had created such a monopoly that coal had been immensely increased in value, until at last the Government were obliged to repeal the duty.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—But the duty is higher there.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said clearly then, if the system was a good one, the greater the protection afforded, the greater the advantage to the country [hear, hear]. He believed that this discussion would not in any way interfere with the Joint High Commission, but it could not fail to have a beneficial effect on the public mind in the United States by showing the public sentiment of Canada against the tax.

Mr. HARRISON said the duty had been tried, and he believed it was objectionable in every respect. As represented by the

hon. member for East Toronto, it was an unequal tax, pressing heavily upon Toronto, and especially upon people residing in cities. He did not believe it was calculated to foster our trade. The proper way to do that was to enlarge our canals (hear, hear.) He was not opposed to the tax on American vessels. That was a tax on foreigners, and there was no analogy between that and this tax on the necessities of life. The duty had been given a fair trial, and it was now time to repeal it (hear, hear.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT suggested that in view of the events of last year, the debate be adjourned till half-past seven, when no doubt the Government would announce a satisfactory policy (laughter.)

Mr. MILLS criticised the speech of the President of the Council, and said that the result of the elections this week had shown that this policy was not approved of in Ontario.

Hon. Col. GREY defended the duty on the ground that a national policy should be adopted, even though it should be found obnoxious to the people at the outset.

Mr. COLBY did not think one year's trial of this tax was sufficient. But even though it had been it would not be advisable to make any change at present.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET moved an amendment to the amendment, to the effect that the duty be removed also from salt, beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all grains, Indian meal, oatmeal, and flour of every other grain. He said that he had supported the Government policy last year, and when he returned home he found that he had been received in a rather cool manner by his constituents in consequence. He believed that the tax had been tried long enough to show that it was obnoxious to the people [cheers]

Hon. Mr. HOLTON was glad that the hon. member had supplemented the items to be included in the free list, and he would adopt it without hesitation. He (Mr. Holton) believed that the hon. member was only the exponent of the changed views of the Government on the subject. He inferred so from seeing the honourable gentleman conferring with the Government before proposing the amendment.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the hon. member for Chateaugay was wrong in his inference, but he [Sir Francis] could say for the Government that if any articles of this description were to be admitted free, it should be *en bloc* and not a few articles selected by hon. members opposite, who wished to do a little log-rolling; therefore the Government would oppose the motion of the hon. member for Chateaugay, but

they would vote for the amendment to the amendment [cheers and laughter]. If any change was to be made at all, it should be a sweeping one and not extended to one or two articles merely [cheers].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK was opposed to the duties on their merits, but if the Government put the question on the ground that the removal of these duties would be prejudicial to the country he would oppose both motions. He could not see how the Government could oppose the motion of the hon. Member for Chateaugay and vote for the amendment to it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said he would support the motion for the hon. member for Chateaugay, believing that the policy of the Government was opposed to the interests of the country.

Hon. JOSEPH HOWE defended the course of the Government with respect to the imposition of the duty and their active protection of the Fisheries. He said it had not only drawn the attention of American statesmen to the importance of coming to some arrangement with the Dominion, but it had forced upon the attention of Great Britain, the necessity for putting an end to these as well as other international questions between Canada and the United States. The result of this was the appointment of the Joint High Commission and the question was, was it advisable while that Commission was in Session, to make any alterations in our tariff.

Mr. WHITEHEAD hoped the Government would support the stand they had taken last year. It might not be approved of by the cities, but the country at large was not opposed to it and it was the country that made the towns.

Mr. RYAN [Montreal] said that he had been entirely opposed to the imposition of the duties from the outset. If the Government intended to support the amendment of the hon. member for Levis for the purpose of defeating the motion of the hon. member for Chateaugay, he warned them that he would not support them in such a policy. Less coal had been imported into Ontario last year than previously.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the policy of the Government was that it was inexpedient to make the change just now.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) and the Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT rose at the same time to speak, amid cries of "vote, vote."

The House rose for recess at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. PICKARD moved the second read-

ing of Bill No. 24, an Act to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, as amended by Committee on Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS thought the Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee, but had no particular objection to the Bill.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON, said the main object of the Bill was to build a Bridge, allowing Railways to use it.

Mr. PICKARD explained the object of the Bill. The proposed bridge would be a link in the line of communication between the Provinces, and would do much to strengthen the commercial union of the different parts of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON spoke as to the proper way in which the Bill should be dealt with. He did not think that there was anything to prevent its being considered.

The SPEAKER ruled that the motion should be proceeded with.

Motion carried, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole forthwith.

The House then went into Committee,

Mr. HARRISON in the chair.

The Bill passed through the Committee, to be read a third time to-morrow.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

The debate was resumed by

Mr. GIBBS, of Oshawa—He had advocated the imposition of the duties at the previous session as tending to procure Reciprocity. The policy had not been sufficiently long in operation to enable any one to say whether it was desirable or not, —and no one could found an argument on what effect had yet been produced. The question was whether they should deliberately weaken the hands of the representative of Canada at Washington, by following the course proposed by the hon. member for Chateauguy. Whatever his private views might be he would waive them rather than do so—and he should vote against both amendments. The policy inaugurated was a whole and should not be dealt with in part.

Mr. CAMERON (of Huron) said there appeared to be a want of harmony amongst the hon. members on the Treasury Benches on this subject. How then could the House be expected to stultify themselves by voting for one amendment and against the other. The hon. members for East and West Toronto, notwithstanding their speeches to-day, voted against exactly the same motion when proposed by the hon. member for Chateauguy last year. He (Mr. Cameron) would vote against both motions, and thus

Mr. Pickard.

sustain the policy of the Government as he had done last session. He regarded that policy as a sound one, and he knew that, so far as his own county was concerned, the people would sustain it. The effect of it was that the Americans had come down from the high position they had occupied and were now prepared to deal fairly and equitably with Canada, and those in this country who were engaged in the carrying trade between the two countries found that they could enter into it with something like fair play and justice. That result was mainly owing to the stand taken by our Government, and until the result of the High Commission should be known, it would not be advisable to make any change in the tariff.

Mr. HARRISON defended himself from the attacks of the hon. member for Huron. He [Mr. Harrison] had voted for that tax last year, though he was opposed to the principle, believing that good would come of it. He had simply voted for it to give it a fair trial. That trial had proved it to be a bad policy for this country, and he now voted for the repeal of the tax.

Mr. BLAKE said he was glad that the hon. member for West Toronto had discovered that out of evil bad alone can come.

Mr. JACKSON supported the policy of the Government, believing that it was inopportune to make any changes in the Tariff at present.

Mr. BEATY explained how he had voted for the imposition of the tax last year. He voted in favor of the general policy with the understanding that coal was not to be included. When the report came up for concurrence he was absent from the House and that was why his vote was not recorded against the imposition of a duty on coal.

A vote was then taken on the amendment of Hon. Mr. BLANCHET, which was carried.

YEAS.—Abbot, Anglin, Archambeault, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Belle-rose, Benoit, Blake, Blanchet, Bolton, Bourassa, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron [Inverness], Caron, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Cimon, Coffin, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Daoust, Delorme, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Forbes, Fortin, Fournier, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Grant, Hagar, Harrison, Hucks [Sir Francis], Holmes, Holton, Howe, Irvine, Jones [Halifax], Kemp, Killam, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Macdonald [Glengarry], Macdonald [Antigonish], Magill, Masson [Soulanges], Masson (Terrebonne), Macdougall (Lanark), Macdougall (Three Rivers), McMonies, Merritt, Mills, Moffat, Morris, Morrisson (Victoria), Morrison (Niagara), Oliver, Paquet, Pearson,

Pelletier, Picard, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ross (Wellington), Ryan (Kings, N. B.), Ryan (Montreal), Savary, Scatcherd, Simard, Simpson, Smith, Snider, Stirtion, Sylvain, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Wallis, Whyte, Workman, Wright [Ontario], Wright [York, Ontario]—103.

NAYS—Ault, Baker, Bertrand, Bown, Cameron [Huron], Campbell, Colby, Crawford [Brockville], Dobbie, Gibbs, Grey, Grover, Jackson, Jones (Leeds), Keeler, Lapum, Lawson, Macdonald [Lunenburg], McKeagney, Perry, Pinsonneault, Ross [Dundas], Scriber, Shanly, Street, Webb, Whitehead, and Wilson—28.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that the position of the Government was this [and they were a unit on the subject] that they deprecated at the present time any interference with the commercial policy of the country with regard to these duties. But at the same time when they found that a number of hon. gentlemen who supported the Government, avowed their intention to support a motion which embraced certain particular articles which were subject to duty along with other articles, they certainly did think that all ought to be put in the same position, and that the House should vote upon the whole of them. But, with regard to the whole of them, the Government were a unit in opposing the amendment as now amended. He would say further that when the Government were called upon to consider at an early period when they reduced the taxation, this question engaged their anxious consideration and the conclusion at which the Government had arrived was this—to maintain these duties, not on the abstract merits of them nor on the ground of revenue, but on the ground that it was not expedient during the present negotiations at Washington to interfere with them. He was perfectly certain in his own mind that it was not in the interest of the Dominion that these duties should be interfered with at present.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that unless the hon. Finance Minister was prepared to tell the House that this question was definitely before the Commission, he could not withdraw his motion. The hon. gentleman could not—dared not say so, and he [Mr. Holton] did not believe that it was.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said he had just received since six o'clock a telegram from the first Minister of the Dominion at Washington to say that duties on coal and salt would not be taken off until December. He repeated at some length his argu-

ments against removing the duties at present.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON replied denying that he was disposed to yield any thing to the United States. He opposed these duties because he believed them to be prejudicial to the interests of the Dominion.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government had only voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Levis in order to place the whole question fairly before the House, and not allow the question to be on a few articles only. Referring to what had been said by the members for Montreal, he was quite ready to explain why he had voted for duty on coal,—he had done so to encourage interprovincial trade. He referred to the position of each Province as regarded the duties, showing that the producers in Ontario were benefitted, and Quebec was specially interested in the maintenance of the duties. He (Sir Geo. E.) might once have had to apologise for opposing the hon. member for Chateaugay, but the case might be reversed, and that hon. member might have to go to his constituents and apologise for having refused to protect the agricultural interests of his Province. The mineral possessions of Nova Scotia would be developed and utilized, and New Brunswick, though not so directly benefitted, as the other Provinces, received great indirect advantages from the increased prosperity of the other parts of the Dominion. He then referred to the High Commission, and said that although nothing definite was known, it was certainly possible that, as in 1854, the Fishery question might bring up other matters of commercial interest to the two countries, and as the Governor in Council had power to do away with the duties on receiving equivalent benefits from the States, why should not the Government be trusted. That was the position of the Government; they had only voted in favour of the amendment of the member for Levis in order to bring the matter before the House in its entirety. He then repeated his remarks in French.

Mr. WORKMAN [Montreal] said he had opposed the policy of the Government when it had commenced, and he'did so still. He believed the Government measure to be both wrong and ridiculous. The Fishery question had no connection whatever with the matter. There was no doubt whatever that the duty had increased the price of coal. It was absurd to imagine that the protective duties before the House would have any effect in obtaining Reciprocity. If the majority of the House was against the Government the Government ought to admit it, and not stoop to

the miserable subterfuges to which they had been reduced, and he for one was determined not to be whipped in by anything the Minister of Militia might say.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER had no desire to whip in either the member for Montreal or any other member of the House, and he appealed to the House that he had never attempted anything of the sort.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN thought that those who voted with the Government on the previous decision should consider well their position. The amendment which had been carried was to all intents and purposes a Government motion and the Government were pledged to support it, and he did not see how any one could consistently vote in favour of putting the various articles on the free list, and a few hours afterwards reverse their vote. The Minister of Militia in asking the House to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, asked them in point of fact to place themselves entirely dependent on the action of the Government at Washington. He maintained that the United States should not be considered, but that Canadian interests alone should be consulted. He protested against the fishery question being in any way mixed up with the present matter. The increase in the coal trade of Nova Scotia had in no way arisen from the duty imposed on it. The tax on flour was most odious and intolerable to the people of New Brunswick. He gave his unqualified support not only to the motion of the member for Chateauguay but to the more enlarged motion of the Government, expressed through their supporter, the member for Levis.

Mr. COLBY said there was no doubt that Canada desired better trade relations with the States. For years subsequently to the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty the policy of the Government had not been framed to attain that object, but latterly, pressure had been brought on the Government, and they determined to treat the United States in the same way as they were treated. He was convinced that reciprocity with the States could only be obtained as a matter of bargain, and every thing should be done that would strengthen the hands of those in the United States, who were willing to concede Reciprocity, and not sacrifice everything that could be given as an equivalent. The natural sequence of the High Commission would be the re-opening of trade negotiations, and the offering of some equivalent on the part of the United States in return for the enjoyment of the Canadian Fisheries. He moved an amendment, that all the words in the previous amendment be struck out,

Mr Workman.

and that there be substituted, that it is inexpedient during the present Session of Parliament to make any alteration in the customs duties, on coal, coke, wheat, flour, salt, peas, beans, barley, rye, oats, meals, &c., &c.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL raised the point of order that the amendment was a simple negative of the motion before the House, and was therefore out of order.

The SPEAKER however ruled the amendment in order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the House had already expressed its opinion, and could scarcely change its decision at the present stage.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN maintained that the House had simply changed the motion before the House but was not committed to a single item.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the House had affirmed the expediency of going into committee on the amended proposition.

The SPEAKER ruled that the House had simply decided that certain words should be added to the first amendment, but that amendment had not been disposed of.

Hon. Col. GREY seconded the motion of the member for Stanstead, and said he sustained the policy on the ground of its being National, and on the ground that under any circumstances, the present was a very inexpedient time to make any change.

Hon. Mr. SMITH said that on the present occasion the member for St. John, hardly represented nineteen-twentieths of the people of New Brunswick. Those people were unanimously opposed to the duties and would do anything to get rid of them. The duties might appear beneficial to Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia, but New Brunswick certainly suffered from the duty on each article. As to the High Commission, there was not the least evidence to show that that body would consider the question, and therefore, it could not be said that it was inexpedient to discuss the matter now on that account. If he felt that the country would be at all prejudiced by a discussion at the present time, he would certainly oppose it, but he could not think that anything of the sort could be the case.

Mr. MACDONALD [Glengary] thought that the Opposition from Ontario could not be charged with want of consideration for the Lower Provinces, for a large majority had supported the repeal of the duties, and in every measure that had passed the House, the Ontario Opposition had invariably assisted the Lower Provinces. Ontario was totally opposed to make bread

dearer to the Lower Provinces, and if the coal duty was a benefit to Nova Scotia, it was a direct tax on Ontario. It was the most injurious tax that had ever been levied, and he trusted it would be wiped off the Statute Book.

Mr. ROSS [Prince Edward] wanted to speak in the interests of the farmers of the Dominion, and was ready to support the Government in retaining the protective duties. He was in favour of reciprocity, but in the absence of reciprocity the farmers should be protected.

Mr. GEOFFRION spoke in French in opposition to the Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON again spoke on the motion of order. He quoted authority to show that the amendment of the member for Stanstead was out of order.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN maintained that the practice of the House was entirely opposed to the authority quoted, and quoted an instance similar to the present.

Mr. BLAKE maintained that English practice ruled in the House, and that the amendment was clearly out of order.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER maintained that the amendment of the member for Chateauguay, as amended, had not been decided upon.

The SPEAKER ruled that certain words having been added, they could not be struck out, and the amendment of the member for Stanstead was therefore out of order.

Mr. PICKARD said that New Brunswick was almost unanimously opposed to the duties.

Mr. CURRIER moved an amendment that pork should be added to the free list.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS trusted the hon. member would not press his amendment. Pork was an article on which there had long been a duty, and there had been no petitions for the repeal. The hon. member was really trifling with the tariff.

Mr. WRIGHT (Ottawa) hoped the Minister of Finance would see the importance of repealing the duty on Pork.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) thought the policy of the restrictive duties met with general approbation and was sorry the Government had not met the proposal of the hon. member for Chateauguay fairly and voted it down.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that the amount of revenue derived from pork was \$60,000.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON thought that pork should not be included, unless the entire tariff was abolished, the line must be drawn somewhere.

On the suggestion of Mr. HOLTON, Mr. Currier's amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. MACDONALD (Lunenburg) said that if pork was freed, other articles might be brought forward, until there was no Tariff. He did not think the protective policy had been sufficiently tried, and he should support its being maintained. The duties before the House did not stand alone, but was only part of a large policy, and if part was repealed, the whole should go. The commercial prosperity of the country was certainly an evidence of the good effect of the policy commenced last year, and at the present time it was certainly inexpedient to interfere with it, and the House was bound to respect the statement of the Government, that the discussion might be prejudicial to the good result of the High Commission.

The motion of the member for Chateauguay as amended was then put with the following result: Yeas, 83; Nays, 55.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Béchard, Benoit, Blake, Blanchet, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Caron, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Cimoh, Coffin, Coupal, Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Delorme, Dufresne, Ferris, Forbes, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Hagar, Harrison, Holton, Irvine, Jones (Halifax), Kempt, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langlois, Little, Macdonald (Glengarry), Magill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Merritt, Mills, Moffatt, Morrison [Victoria, O.], Oliver, Pâquet, Pearson, Pelletier, Pickard, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Renaud, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Ryan [Montreal West], Scatcherd, Smith, Snider, Stirtion, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tourangeau, Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, Workman, Wright [Ottawa County], Wright [York, Ontario W. R.]—83.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Bellerose, Bertrand, Bown, Cameron [Huron], Campbell, Cartier [Sir George E.], Colby, Costignani, Crawford [Brockville], Daoust, Dobbie, Dunkin, Fortin, Gaucher, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holmes, Howe, Jackson, Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Keeler, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Nunenburg], McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, McMillan, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Perry, Pinsonneault, Robitaille, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ryan [King's, N. B.], Savary, Sriver, Simard, Simpson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tupper, Webb, White, Whitehead, Wilson—55.

The House then went into Committee, Mr. MILLS in the chair.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS suggested that time should be given to frame a proper amendment.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON assented and the Committee reported progress and asked leave to sit again, and,

The House adjourned at 12.45.

THURSDAY, March 23, 1871.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

After routine,

Mr. KILLAM introduced a Bill to incorporate the Western Bank.

Mr. WORKMAN withdrew the Bill to incorporate the Sun Insurance Company.

Mr. MAGILL introduced a Bill to amend the Insolvent Act of 1869.

Mr. SIMARD introduced a Bill to amend the Act incorporating the Quebec Marine and Fire Insurance Company.

Mr. IRVINE introduced a Bill to make provision for the detention of Female convicts in the Reformatory Prison of the Province of Quebec.

THE DEBATE ON BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER announced that the Government had made no further arrangement for special reports of the debates on the British Columbia measure.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT was sorry that the Government had come to this conclusion.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) believed the Government deserved credit for the decision to which they had come. He was about to proceed further, when

The SPEAKER called him to order. There was no question before the House.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) thought he had as good a right to speak on the subject as other hon. gentlemen.

The SPEAKER explained that a minister of the Crown had simply answered a question put on a former occasion by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, and there the matter should drop.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) said he was sorry to be obliged to resort to extreme measures, but he had a precedent for it only the other day. He moved the adjournment of the House. [Laughter.] He continued at some length to explain that he was elected on the Independent ticket, and though he might have erred in judgment he had always endeavoured to preserve economy in the administration of public affairs. [At this point the hon. gentleman's voice became inaudible, owing to the slamming of desks and other noises in the House re-

Mr. McDonald.

sorted to, to silence him.] He did not approve of going to any additional expense in the British Columbia matter.

The SPEAKER suggested that it would be as well to postpone the discussion until the British Columbia Bill should be before the House.

Mr. JONES bowed to the opinion of the Speaker.

Mr. RYMAL rose to reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville, with respect to his [Mr. Rymal's] course in Parliament. The hon. member had seen fit to take him [Mr. Rymal] to task and would fain make the House believe that he would encourage extravagance in the administration of public affairs. He [Mr. Rymal] believed that his course would show that he had advocated economy whenever it was in the interest of the public, and he had no desire that every man's utterances should be fully reported in the case. He had no desire that a column should be given to his own speech, though the hon. member for Leeds might. Whether that hon. gentleman was reported in the regular way or not, he [Mr. Rymal] could not say, but he had frequently noticed that if the hon. member only spoke for five minutes in the House, a column report of it, at least, appeared in the papers [laughter]. No doubt the hon. member engaged a special reporter to record his wise sayings. As for the charge of inconsistency and want of independence, he [Mr. Rymal] left it to those who had known them to say whether he or the hon. member for Leeds was the more deserving of the charge. The hon. member's course had been what Wm. Lyon Mackenzie had said of such members—that those who boasted of independence in the House were those who never could be depended on [laughter].

QUESTIONS.

Mr. FORBES asked whether, in view of the business doing between the Dominion and the British and Foreign West Indies, it is the intention of the Government to increase the mail accommodation, *during this year*, between those countries so as to give greater advantage and larger development to this important trade?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the attention of the Government had been drawn to the importance of establishing such a service, but considered it not advisable to undertake it yet.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK asked whether it is the intention of the Government to issue stamped paper for the purposes of the Promissory Notes Stamp Act?

Hon. Mr. MORRIS replied that the subject was at this moment under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. BEAKE moved that this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions :—

RESOLUTIONS ON NORTH WESTERN TERRITORIES.

1. That the sense of the House of the respective Legislatures of the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick was taken as to, and formed the basis of the Imperial Legislation under which the said Provinces were federally united into the Dominion of Canada.

2. That it was by the British North America Act (1867) enacted that it should be lawful for the Queen by and with the advice of the Privy Council on Addresses from the Houses of Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory, or either of them, into the Union by the said Act created, on such terms and conditions as the Queen should think fit to approve, subject to the provisions of the said Act; and that the Provisions of any such Order in Council should have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

3. That Addresses have been passed by both Houses of the Parliament of Canada touching the admission of the said Territories into the Union, and Canada has paid large sums, and incurred large liabilities in order to accomplish such admission, and an Order in Council has been made by the Queen for such admission.

3. That the Parliament of Canada has assumed to exercise jurisdiction over the said Territories and to make provision for the erection of part of the said Territories into the Province of Manitoba, and for the establishment of federal relations between the said Provinces and Canada.

5. That it has been made to appear to this House that the Canadian Government has requested the Government of the United Kingdom to submit to the Parliament of the United Kingdom a Bill touching the said North Western Territories or some part thereof; and that the Government of the United Kingdom in consequence of such request has proposed to the Canadian Government to submit a Bill—a draft of which has been forwarded to the Canadian Government.

6. That in the opinion of this House the sense of both Houses of the Parliament of Canada should be taken as to and should form the basis of such proposed legislation.

He said that he proposed in these resolutions to establish the principle that legislation on matters affecting this coun-

try should only be undertaken in the Imperial Government when sought for by the people of this country through their representatives. This principle became of still greater consequence when the legislation sought for was of a character which would alter in a material point the compact upon which the union itself was formed, which violated in its most important ingredient the question of the distribution of power, to reintroduce the former evils from which the people of old Canada suffered, and which led to the introduction of the constitution under which we now lived. Not only that, but that it should be done at the instance of a Minister of the Crown when there was nothing to prevent them from asking the people of this country through their Representatives to determine what change, if any, should be made in the constitution of the country, that a Minister of the Crown under such circumstances should have ventured to apply to the Home Government and should have sent home a draft of a Bill which they asked Earl Kimberly to make law, was without precedent, without parallel, without excuse, without palliation (cheers.) He (Mr. Blake) did not see how it could be done, or how defended. He did not know under what tenure Members sat in this House if the law could be altered at the suggestion of a Minister of the Crown, without the consent of Parliament. Now according to the terms of the Union Act, it was set forth that such legislation should take place by the Imperial Government, not on such terms and conditions as the Queen should think fit to approve, but on such terms as the Queen should see fit to approve subject to the advice of this House. It was on such terms that the four Provinces were united into one Confederation, and it was under the same conditions under which the North Western Territories should come in. It was entirely premature to discuss the merits of the Bill and he hoped they would not be dragged into this discussion. He simply wanted the House to say—apart from the consideration of the question, whether the Bill was perfectly right or wrong, or between the two—that it was the duty of Government to initiate a measure asking the Queen to move the Imperial Parliament to enact a certain law. He wished to disencumber the Bill of all consideration as to its character or necessity. He found that the Hon. Minister of Militia, acting for and in the absence of the leader of the Government, had pointed out that it was absolutely necessary that Manitoba should have (as the Opposition had contended from the beginning it should have) its rights as a Province from the same high source as

the Dominion. He asked the House to agree that it was their duty to take care that they should determine what legislation the Imperial Parliament be asked to enact on their behalf. Hon. gentlemen opposite might say that the sense of the Parliament of Canada had already been taken on the Bill.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE thought that was the paltry evasion they would make, but he would tell them that the draft sent to England went far beyond the Manitoba Bill and beyond Manitoba itself, stretching even to British Columbia. He would tell them besides that what the Canadian Parliament did last session it did, knowing that its act was not irrevocable, but it was quite another and a different thing for them to determine to ask the Imperial Parliament to pass an Act which this House could not at all repeal. No man could fairly and candidly argue, and no man acting as Minister of the Crown dared argue that it was the same thing. What the Imperial Parliament did, was a law of the Medes and Persians as far as this country was concerned. The question was whether the people were prepared to surrender into the hands of the Government of the day that power of which the Government of the day was assuming it possessed—the power to ask the Imperial Parliament to make laws for us; or whether the House did not think that every sense of duty called upon them to determine that their sense—that was the sense of the people—was to be taken upon and was to form the basis of that Imperial Legislation.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER thought the hon. member should have backed up his resolutions with more logic, argument, and law than he had listened to. Every one remembered the different arguments used on both sides of the House when the Manitoba Act was discussed. Some contended we had no right to legislate on the question. On this side it was held we had a right to give a Constitution to that Province and the North West. The 146th clause of the Union Act provided for the manner in which the colonies and provinces having political constitutions should be admitted into the Confederation. (He read the clause showing the necessity of the formality of previous addresses with that object). The incorporation of Rupert's Land and the North West was to take place on addresses of Parliament, the terms agreed to Canada and to Her Majesty in Council, respectively, receiving due consideration. After the question was fully considered in Canada, it was decided that the best way to secure the

admission of the North West was to avoid transactions with the Hudson's Bay Company. Canada, in accordance with the Union Act had proceeded by address to solicit the incorporation of the North West with Canada. It was known to Her Majesty's Government and Parliament, that if once Canada annexed a region twenty times as large, she would not have the right of inheritance or transmission—would not have full sovereign rights for all time to come. Under the transfer made us by the Queen, we have all the privileges and powers previously appertaining to the Hudson's Bay Company. When we had passed our address to obtain that territory, we passed our Act in anticipation, knowing it would only belong to us when Her Majesty issued her Order in Council. The constitutionality of that act was not questioned then.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Yes. The member for Bothwell raised the point.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it could not have been forcibly raised, for no division could have been taken on it. He did not remember any positive objection to our first Act, when passed. We stated that though not actually in possession of the North West territory, we thought we should legislate in a manner to be able to annex or deal with it the moment the Imperial sanction was given. The advisers of Her Majesty made no objection. On the contrary the action of Canada was endorsed by the British Legislature. The transfer did not take place when we expected, owing to the Manitoba trouble. During the whole of it, we were not the owners of the territory because Her Majesty had not made the transfer, which took place only on the 15th July last. Then we had delegates from Red River to state their grievances, in response to the invitation of the Governor General. The Imperial Government was unwilling to send any military expedition to the North West till the Canadian Government settled the claims of the inhabitants, and granted their rights. His colleagues and himself acted all through in harmony with the wishes of the Imperial Government. The result of the negotiations with the Red River delegates was the Bill of last session. The member for Bothwell questioned the power of this Parliament to pass such a Bill, in view of its interference with the constitutional interests and position of the other Provinces. We had positive power to enact the Rupert's Land Bill power granted by the Imperial Legislature itself. To meet the objections of the member for Bothwell, he announced that they would obtain an act confirming their proceedings, and also a provision

Mr. Blake.

enacting that Provinces created out of the territory and afterwards admitted into the Union should be regarded as admitted under the Confederation Act itself. That was obtained accordingly. They had power when they passed the Act not only of an inferential but positive character, which the Manitoba Act showed. They passed the Rupert's Land Act in anticipation, and not only it but the Manitoba Act received the sanction of Her Majesty's Government. To remove all doubts on the subject they had submitted all the questions raised on this head to the Imperial Government. Their course in all respects, and as regards both Acts, was decidedly approved. The object of one of the clauses in the Manitoba Act was to prevent the alteration of its local constitution without the consent of its people. The object of the Bill was to place it on the same footing as to constitutional rights as any of the Provinces in the Union. He denied the statement of the member for West Durham, that there was a provision in the Bill affecting British Columbia. There was a reference to that Territory in the report, not in the Bill. He also complained that the House was not allowed an opportunity of expressing its will on this measure. Now, in a few minutes, he (Sir Geo. E. Cartier) would afford that opportunity (hear, hear). Why did not the Opposition last session move an amendment to the Government's proposal on this subject. Could we declare our will more solemnly, more properly than by an Act which the British Government had a right to disallow. The Government had not gone beyond its right or duty in this matter as the House would now see and would hereafter admit. He would move in amendment that all the words after "that" in the said resolutions be struck out, and the following substituted. That this House, after full consideration passed, the Act to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba. Second, That the Act has received the sanction and approval of the Imperial Government. Third, That for the removal of doubts as to certain provisions of the said Act the Government of Canada has requested the Imperial Government to pass an Act in the Imperial Parliament confirmatory of the said first mentioned Act. Fourth, That the Imperial Government have agreed to introduce a Bill to the aforesaid effect, and declaring also the power of the Parliament of Canada to create other Provinces in the vast territory of the North West now forming part of the Dominion, and to give them constitutions on the same footing as to guarantees of permanence and otherwise with the constitution of the old Provinces.

Fifth, That the draft of the said proposed Act has been communicated to this House. Sixth, That the provisions of the said draft Act meet the approval of the House, and are in consonance with the will of this House as expressed in the most formal manner in the said Act relating to Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised the point of order that the Minister of Militia could not move in amendment to a simple motion, what was really a series of Resolutions.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER maintained that his amendment was all one and not a series of resolutions.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON supported Sir George E. Cartier's view of the case—and

The SPEAKER ruled that the amendment must be treated as one Resolution, and that it was in order.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought the House had good reason to complain of the way in which the Minister of Militia had moved his amendment. The real question of discussion was the propriety of the Government approaching the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of changing the Act of Confederation without the direct authority of both Houses—which question was entirely changed by the amendment of the Minister of Militia—who had not in the slightest degree answered the point maintained by the member for West Durham. He thought the very greatest care should be exercised in dealing with the "British North America Act of 1867." Under the old Province of Canada, the Union Act of Upper Canada had never been changed except on address of the Legislature, and it was most important that the same rule should be followed in dealing with "The British North America Act of 1867." As to the assertion of the Minister of Militia, than an Act of Parliament was as solemn as an address, he agreed with the member for West Durham, that whereas an Act could always be changed, an address could not be. He believed the House had full power to legislate in respect of the North West, although there might be some doubt as to the representation of that country in Parliament, but the action of the Government tended to divest them, if not of the power of legislating, certainly of the power of repealing, in that they had approached the Imperial Parliament without the sanction of the Parliament of Canada. He did not think the manner in which the Minister of Militia proposed to deal with the question was the solemn manner in which it should be dealt with, for such a motion should not have been introduced without notice; and

without allowing full opportunity for consideration, in order that the people of the country might not be lightly deprived of powers they now possessed. It was very desirable that Parliament should have the power of making laws to govern the North West, and while every one would be prepared to endorse the Manitoba Bill, were an address proposed to that effect, he was not prepared to allow the Government to exercise a power which should alone be exercised by Parliament, and he hoped the Government would see the propriety of proceeding by way of address. The matter was one of great importance, for the only security the Provinces had was that their constitutional rights could not be changed by any Government that might be in power, but by Parliament only. He thought the Government before taking the vote, should consider whether it would not be better to decide that for all time to come, no change should be made in the British North America Act except in the usual approved mode of address to the Queen.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON (Toronto, West) said that the British North America Act was the constitution and fundamental law of the country, and no change could be effected in it but by the action of the Imperial Government, and he agreed with those who maintained that no change should be based on representations of the Government but by address from both Houses of Parliament, as otherwise the Imperial Parliament would be acting without a proper representation of the wishes of the people. He himself had never doubted the legality of the Manitoba Act, but there were doubts on the subject, which had arisen on the defective framing of "The British North America Act of 1867." That Act provided for the Union of the four Provinces, first forming the Dominion, and also for the admission of other colonies, and the Provinces in the last respect were certainly defective. If the Act of the Imperial Parliament was simply an echo of the Manitoba Act, it might be said that the Legislature in passing that Act, had in effect asked the Imperial Parliament to confirm it, but the Imperial Act went beyond the Manitoba Act and contained matter on which the Canadian Parliament had never expressed an opinion. He was entirely convinced as to the propriety of the North West legislation, and he thought if the Government would propose an address involving that Legislation, it would be generally supported. He thought the amendment of the Minister of Militia did not go far enough, but if, after the recital of the facts, it was followed by a recital of

the Manitoba Act, and then provided that an address should be presented by both Houses for the confirmation of that Act all difficulty would be removed. This was more than a mere matter of form, for all would feel that it was not desirable that the Imperial Parliament should proceed to make any changes in the constitution except on a deliberate expression of the wishes of the people, through their representatives in both Houses.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that his amendment in no way excluded the subsequent passing of such an address. He had merely desired to meet the resolutions of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON asked whether the Government would undertake to move such an address?

Hon. Mr. DORION (Hochelaga) considered that the real question was whether the Government should be allowed to ask the Imperial Parliament to change in any way the Constitutional Act, without direct reference to Parliament. If they could do so on an unimportant measure, there was no reason why they should not do it on the most important. He referred to the fact that the old Province of Canada had ever been most careful that no constitutional change should take place except on a deliberate expression of opinion by the Legislature. He then moved, seconded by Mr. Mills, in amendment to the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia, that all the words after "that" be struck out, and that the following be substituted—"Irrespective of the merits of the measure proposed by the Government of Canada, to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of confirming certain Canadian legislation, depriving the Parliament of Canada of certain existing powers, and altering the "British North America Act of 1867" of this House would be wanting in its duty if it did not express its decided opinion that no such Imperial legislation should be asked for by the Government of Canada, except after the details that such proposed legislation shall have been submitted to both Houses of the Parliament of Canada for judgment, and an address of such Houses to the Queen, praying for such legislation shall have been passed.

Mr. R. A. HARRISON raised a point of order, submitting that the amendment of the hon. member for Hochelaga, was simply equivalent to the original resolutions.

Hon. Mr. DORION stated that the original proposition was to go into the Com-

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt.

mittee to consider certain resolutions, and that his amendment was an entirely different proposal and was entirely in order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON also argued that the amendment was in many respects different from the original proposition and was entirely in order.

It being six o'clock, the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the Government had taken any action yet with respect to the removal of duties in compliance with the wishes of the House last night.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he had no doubt whatever that the new change of duty would have effect at the same time that it was intended to take effect by the first resolution, abandoning the five per cent duties, viz: On the 1st of April next arrangements of a different kind had been made yesterday, and if he had anticipated the long discussion which took place last evening he would have made other arrangements.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON enquired whether the Government proposed to do anything with respect to the appropriations for fortifications without previously consulting Parliament. The House passed an Act some two or three Sessions ago appropriating a certain amount of money for the purpose of constructing fortifications, conditioned upon an Imperial guarantee being extended to Canada for the amount. An Act of the Imperial Parliament was passed during last year pledging this guarantee on the terms contemplated by the Act. He thought the country was entitled to know whether the hon. gentlemen opposite were proceeding under the authority of these two Acts, the Act of the Imperial Parliament and the Act of this Parliament, to expend the money without previously consulting this Parliament.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the question of the hon. member was one of which a formal notice should have been given, but he (Sir Geo. E.) might say for himself that the question of fortifications was now in the same state as it was three months ago. It was a question which the Government had not yet been called upon by the Imperial Government to consider. Hon. gentlemen were aware that the appropriations for fortifications had been made to carry out strategic works recommended by the Imperial authorities in England. The recent war in France would no doubt cause them to change their plans.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON notified the Government that on the next occasion on going into Committee of Supply he would renew his enquiry with a view to eliciting from

the Government an explicit statement as to their intentions with respect to the expenditure on fortifications between this session and next meeting of Parliament, without having consulted Parliament on the subject.

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. STREET in the chair.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

On the item of \$6,000,000 for the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explanations,

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained that the rails to be delivered in the fall of 1871 and the spring of 1872 would cost \$1,314,000. The balance of car contracts coming due in the spring of 1872 amounted to \$244,000; balance of ties contracts, \$100,000; contracts for forty locomotives to be delivered this year, \$477,000; contract for the buildings at Moncton, \$84,000; ballasting, \$225,000; works on permanent way, \$3,300,000; engineering staff expenses, \$175,000; management, \$23,000; printing, advertising, &c., \$2,000. Total, \$5,944,500. The supply system would be discontinued in June. He was unable now to give a statement of expenditure from January 1st, 1871 till the 30th of June next, but he would furnish it on concurrence.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said it would be impossible to tell how the work would proceed, and therefore it was impossible to estimate safely that expenditure.

Mr. MACKENZIE complained of the management in the construction of the railway. An instance of it came under his own observation some time ago, and he had mentioned it in a speech. In one place he had seen a staff of twelve engineers and only about forty-four men and five or six horses. That statement had since been contradicted, but he spoke from personal observation. The Government should give more complete information on the subject.

Mr. WALSH said that the twelve engineers referred to were employed on a considerable section of the road and not all at one place. It was impossible to give an estimate of the expenditure up to the 30th June, as they could not tell what progress would be made.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) advocated a gauge of four feet eight and a half inches. This gauge should be adopted on all roads in future, and the Grand Trunk would be brought to adopt it, too, on their whole line. The American gauge was cheaper and amply sufficient to accommodate all the traffic that the railway could

obtain. The North Shore Road would have the 4 feet 8½ inch American gauge, and it was advisable to have the same gauge from Ottawa to Halifax. The matter was well worthy the consideration of the House.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET advocated a uniform gauge for the Dominion and that should be the narrow gauge. The G. W. R. had adopted it, and so had the Pacific Railway, (hear, hear).

Mr. DUFRESNE thought the Government should inform the House what was their policy on this important matter.

Mr. SHANLY said that the four feet eight and a half inch gauge had now become the gauge for this Continent, and the time would come when the Government would be obliged to adopt it in Canada. He believed it should be made a condition in the charters of all new companies that they should adopt this gauge. It was not so very difficult to make it the uniform gauge of the Dominion as supposed. The Great Western Railway had changed from the broad to the narrow gauge the section of their line between Toronto and Hamilton, a distance of forty-two miles in eight hours, (hear, hear). The sooner the narrow gauge was adopted, the better for all.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN, said that this question had not escaped the attention of the Government but in considering this question they had to take into consideration the Grand Trunk Railway, for it was not advisable to have two gauges in the country, one on the Intercolonial Railway and the other on the Grand Trunk Railway. There were other lines also to be considered. The cost of a change of gauge from Halifax to Truro and from Amherst to Moncton, and the branches of this line would amount to about \$1,000,000. The cost of a change of gauge on the entire length of the Grand Trunk Railway would be between \$2,750,000 and \$3,000,000. Under the circumstances, the Government had come to the conclusion not to change their gauges at present, though the time would come when it might be desirable to do so.

Hon. Mr. McDougall thought it did not require any special knowledge of railway matters to come to the conclusion that sooner or later the narrow gauge would become the gauge of the continent. Even the Grand Trunk acknowledge that they would effect a great saving if they had the means to change their gauge so as to make it correspond with the American lines. The argument that cars coming to a change of gauge would be a great disadvantage, should have no weight in the case of the Intercolonial,

Mr. Macdonald

because it was not proposed to work the two railroads with the same stock. It was well understood by all conversant with railway matters that it was not safe to allow loaded cars to run a greater distance than 500 miles without examination, so that the assumption that the circumstance of the Intercolonial being of the same gauge as the Grand Trunk would allow cars to travel from Sarnia to Halifax without breaking bulk was a fallacy, as it was well known that the Grand Trunk would be very willing to change its gauge provided it had the means, it would be very unwise for the House to allow the Government to construct the Intercolonial on the broad gauge system with the prospect of having to change it in the course of a few years. A very great blunder was committed, and a great wrong was done to the people in the matter of the expenditure on that railway. Several millions would have been saved had the choice of route been different, and he for one had done his utmost to persuade his colleagues and the House that the route chosen was not the proper one. When, however, the route had been chosen it was distinctly understood that the line should be built as cheaply and economically as possible. It was pretty well understood, however, that in violation of that understanding the Government had now decided to make the railway one of the most expensive on the Continent, they had decided to use steel rails, build iron bridges, and in fact construct a first class English Railway—and he trusted the House would not fail to express its opinion on the matter—as grants had already been made by the Governments of New Brunswick and Quebec, which would probably result in building a shorter route before the completion of the Intercolonial—which could not fail to take the greater part of the traffic, both passenger and freight, and as the Intercolonial would become simply a local line, it became the House to insist on it being built as cheaply as possible. He was decidedly in favour of the gauge being narrow, and then in a few years there would be a uniform gauge throughout the Dominion. On another occasion he should submit an amendment to the House in the direction he had argued, first that the gauge should be narrow, and second, that the construction should be as cheap and economical as possible.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said the matter had been considered by the Government most carefully. Every one admitted that it was most unfortunate that the Grand Trunk was not constructed on the narrow gauge system as there was no doubt that it would have been most advantageous had the country had a narrow gauge system altogether.

Not only, however, was the Grand Trunk line broad gauge, but the Government had 300 miles of line in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick of the same gauge. He was very much disappointed on looking into the question to find that there was no considerable saving either in the construction or working of the narrow gauge as compared with the broad. The Government had obtained the opinions of the foremost professional men within their reach, and everything went to show that the difference in construction and operation was very inconsiderable indeed. It was a question of vital importance that all the traffic should be got for the line possible, and he was convinced that a break of gauge anywhere between Montreal and Halifax would increase the cost of freight, and would seriously diminish the amount of traffic that would pass over the line. The matter was however scarcely one that could be intelligently discussed by the House, as it could only be decided by the evidence of the most scientific men, which could be given before the railway, or some other Committee of the House. As to the style of railway that was being constructed he thought the large amount annually necessary to keep the Nova Scotia lines in repair was a sufficient reason to justify the construction in the first instance of a good substantial road which would not require any great outlay for years to come. There was no doubt that a large additional outlay was involved in the adoption of steel rails, but before the Government had decided on that matter they had obtained the reports of the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial and of Mr. Livesey, one of the most distinguished Mechanical Engineers in Great Britain, who stated that although the cost of steel rails largely exceeded that of Iron rails, it would be in the end, the truest economy to use steel rails.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that when in England he had made every possible enquiry as to the best style of rail, and the very greatest authorities had informed him that for a railway with a heavy and constant traffic, steel rails were economical, but in other cases, iron rails were the best. It was very natural that the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial should desire to connect his name with a thoroughly first-class railway, but it was the duty of the House to consider the interests of the people of the country, and to make the expenditure as small as possible—consistent with making the line suitable for the purposes required.

Mr. BODWELL thought as the narrow gauge was so general on the Continent and as it was stated that the Pacific Line

was also to be on the narrow gauge system, and the fact of the Grand Trunk line being a different gauge ought not to induce the Government to conform the Intercolonial to that line. He was convinced that the route chosen was not the one, and thought the Government would do well to consider whether it could not yet be changed. Although a cheap construction might involve an expenditure in order to keep the line in good order, it ought to be considered whether that would not be fully covered by the interest on the additional amount which would be expended on a more costly expenditure. He thought the Government should consider whether it would not be well to adopt the narrow gauge, and to revert to the economical system which they had first entertained.

Hon. JOS. HOWE said he never believed the present route of the Intercolonial would be a commercial success. He never advocated it on that score, but he approved of it as a link to bind the Provinces together. It would promote the settlement of a country, which might under other circumstances have long remained a wilderness. It was not on account of local interests that he advocated the present route. Nova Scotia would be as well satisfied with a line running through the middle of New Brunswick, but, for all that, they believed that the route which had been adopted was the best one, all things considered. He would not enter into a discussion as to the material that should be used in the construction of bridges. That was a matter which could better be settled by the Railway Committee. With regard to the cost of engineering, he would only say that he had compared it with the cost of engineering on other lines, and he was in a position to say that it was less than on any other lines, among them the Nova Scotia lines and the Grand Trunk Railway. He would have no objection to seeing two or three lines running through the Province of New Brunswick. There was room enough for them all, and they would promote closer relations between the Provinces.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL replied to the insinuations thrown out during the debate, that he had sacrificed his principles in order to retain his seat and his salary. But there was a history connected with this question. When the question of the choice of the Intercolonial Railway was under discussion it was well known that there was a difference in the Cabinet on the subject. It was well known that the Minister of Customs and himself formed a minority in the Cabinet. That there were differences of opinion was but natural for it was a subject on which there might be honest differences. He (Mr. McDougall)

had conversed with the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. member for Chateaugay on the subject, but these hon. gentlemen took no steps to press the majority and to sustain the minority on that occasion. When an influential journal in Toronto was asked to oppose the choice of the long route, the answer was "the Government are in a difficult position, there is a division in the Cabinet, let them fight it out." The files of that newspaper were open to every one who wished to consult them, and while this matter was discussed by Government during a time extending several months, no articles could be found in it pointing out the proper course to be adopted. The desire to destroy the Government kept it quiet. With these facts in view he (Mr. McDougall) would not stand here or anywhere else and be told that he sacrificed principle or had a right to take any other course than the one he took while a member of the Government. If he had left the Cabinet, could he have prevented the choice of the northern route under the circumstances? But there were other reasons which influenced him. The question on the North West, in which he felt a deep interest, was still to be disposed of. That question he considered of far more importance than the expenditure of four or five millions of dollars more or less on a work on which there might have been honest differences of opinion. Having done all in his power in endeavoring to prevent the choice of the long route, even to the extent that he had been charged with having taken a course not consistent with his position in the Cabinet, and having failed to obtain any support from those to whom he looked for assistance, he submitted to what appeared to him to be the conclusion of the public on this question and remained in the Government, the majority deciding the matter. With respect to the insinuation that he had been induced by any consideration of his ministerial position or the salary arising from that position to consent to anything that would prejudice the public interest, he repudiated it and he left it to the honorable members opposite to say if he had not on all occasions fearlessly pressed his views in the interest of the public. He knew very well that there was at least one honorable gentleman who would be glad to see him broken down and forced out of public life, but he (Mr. McDougall) would pursue his course fearlessly, regardless of the sneers from either side of the House.

Mr. BLAKE disclaimed any desire to wound the feelings of Hon. Mr. McDougall, but could not refrain from contrasting his former action as a Minister with

Hon. Mr. McDougall.

the recent denunciations of the Intercolonial Railway route, as involving the casting of eight millions of dollars into the sea. He first combined with his colleagues to put this question out of Parliament to deprive it of its rightful authority over a Canadian question and Canadian expenditure. With what grace could he accuse the Ontario Opposition of apathy in assisting him, when in 1867 he took a course which resulted in crippling them, and destroying the fruits of years of labour? He opposed his old colleagues struggling against a Ministry overwhelmingly strong through his alliance, and he now turned round and accused them of leaving him unassisted. In 1868 he aided their political enemies to defeat all attempts to secure a route every way better for the country than the present one. This reproach then should never have come from him (cheers). He was wrong, however, broken and dispirited, as was the Opposition they would have willingly co-operated with him to prevent the absurd suicidal choice determined upon. He should have resigned rather than acquiesce in a decision contrary to his reason and judgment. He lost his opportunity of a fitting protest, and must now be held responsible not only for an indispensible Act but for contributing to break up and destroy the usefulness of his party. He (Mr. Blake) was sorry to make these remarks, but felt bound to vindicate the cause of the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE replied in a similar manner to the remarks of the hon. member for North Lanark, and explained that the Opposition had used all their efforts to prevent the adoption of the North Shore route. He ridiculed the idea that the Opposition had ever been looked to by the minority in the Cabinet to aid in framing the policy of the Ministry. The hon. member for North Lanark had once assured him that he would have resigned rather than submit to the majority, if the Hon. Minister of Customs had gone out with him. He afterwards gave as a second reason for remaining in office, that the Ontario members had not sustained him.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL—Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE condemned strongly the Hon. Mr. Tilley for abandoning his pledge to his constituents to resign if the North Shore route were persisted in, and denounced its character. The Intercolonial would never pay, and already the whole country was convinced of the fact however suitable it was as a military road.

After further discussion,

Mr. MACKENZIE read extracts from his

past speeches to show the determined stand the Opposition had taken in hostility to the North Shore route.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN confessed that he felt thankful that the minority in the Cabinet had not resigned their seats in the Cabinet as he feared they would have done, for if they had, it would have endangered the success of the Robinson route. He had always been in favor of the route, and was glad that it had been chosen. But he could hardly credit the statement that the Government proposed to furnish steel rails to the Grand Trunk Railway, and give the old worn-out rails of that line to the North Shore road. In the interest of economy it was essential that a good substantial line should be constructed in the first instance, and he considered the policy of the Government in this matter as wise and prudent, and one which would be supported by the country and the House. He was not prepared to express an opinion on the subject of gauges but thought the opinion of the member for Grenville was entitled to great weight. The whole subject was of the greatest importance and should receive the fullest and most earnest consideration of the Government. He thought that if anything the amount asked was too little as the work ought to be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE read an extract from a speech he had made in 1867, urging economy in the construction, and shortness of route, and regretting the large vote that had been granted. He said, at that time, the route had not been decided, and he had pointed out as forcibly as he could the result that would follow from the adoption of the longer route, and therefore the member for Lanark must admit that he had the full support of himself and the other members of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL did not see anything very decided in what the hon. member had urged, and further did not think that at the time the speech was given, that hon. gentleman could be considered as representing the views of the Opposition generally.

Mr. WALSH said that under the Union Act the Government had to connect River du Loup with the other lines at Truro, and the line now adopted was actually thirty-five miles shorter than the other route. He had given the matter much consideration, and maintained that the present route was the best.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL said the proprietors of other lines were quite willing to allow the Government running privileges.

Mr. WALSH said no doubt they would, but would have exacted a heavy equivalent. He referred to a remark made by the member for Lambton, that the Government had diverted the line from the Robinson route by way of Newcastle, involving a largely increased expenditure, but he stated that by that diversion ten miles had been saved. The bridge required over the Miramichi was also much smaller than it otherwise would have been. In reference to the gauge, even were any portion placed on the narrow gauge, only a small portion could be so placed. As to what the member for Lanark had said as to cars not being able to go through, that was one of the great advantages that would result. Were the question in its first stage, the narrow gauge might be advisable, but under the present circumstances such could not be done. As to the character of the line, the Government had never been committed to build a cheap road, but had always held that the truest economy would be the construction of a good substantial road. He concluded by saying that one route would have cost as much as the other.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glenarry)—The Minister of Public Works had maintained that the Intercolonial should be of the same gauge as the Grand Trunk,—he thought the Grand Trunk should not be considered. As to the contracts that had been given out for stock, very little had been done, and what had been made could easily be changed. There was no doubt that the narrow gauge could be very much more easily worked in the winter time and of all the many miles of railway now under construction in Ontario, every one was on the narrow gauge system—and under these circumstances the Government should not persist in building the Intercolonial on the broad gauge. As to the break of gauge, let the Government buy from the Grand Trunk Railway the line from Quebec to Riviere du Loup.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said it was absurd to imagine that the country would allow the Government to buy that portion from the Grand Trunk. The Government was simply conforming to the circumstances by which they were surrounded.

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD spoke as to what Mr. Mackenzie had said as to the change of route purposely to oblige a member of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that what he had stated and he had stated it in the House was that the line was taken some miles up the River Miramichi beyond deep water, and that it was then found that the only way to reach deep water was apparently by a switch to Mr. Mitchell's shipyard.

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD said there was no doubt the narrow was the better gauge, but under the arrangements it could not be adopted. The Intercolonial had doubtless done the greatest good to the country through which it passed, and would tend to make land more valuable than in the West. He considered the work had been carried on as fast as possible, considering the difficulties of climate to be contended against. He did not think any money had been wasted, but that the line would be exceedingly beneficial, and Ontario would be astonished to find the amount of traffic that would pass over it.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) said that the Intercolonial had been forced on the Dominion, and whatever the gauge, it would be found that the whole expenditure had been thrown away. The question to be considered was how the line could be completed most economically, and throughout Ontario there was certainly a feeling that a large amount had been squandered. He thought the deference of the Commissioners to the Chief Engineer was very much more than the Chief Engineer showed to them,—for that gentleman in his Report had altogether condemned the mode of proceeding proposed by the Commissioners. The first intention had been to construct a cheap road, but they now seemed to have adopted the most costly plan possible. He thought the narrow gauge ought certainly to be adopted. He had travelled over the country but did not entertain anything like the favorable opinion expressed by the member for West Middlesex. No timber grew, and the land was certainly unfit for cultivation.

Dr. ROBITAILLE stated that the land was covered with birch, maple and soft wood, and some of the finest stock was raised there.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN said that in the valley of the Matapedia the whole of the land was arable and fit for cultivation. This has been ascertained definitely by special surveys, and the land was being taken up very fast.

Mr. WALSH said that no steps had been taken to build a switch at Newcastle, and it was not correct that they were confined to Mr. Mitchell's shipyard for deep water.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked information as to the appropriations for Engineering and Management.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained that the Management consisted of the Commissioners and their staff.

Item passed.

Mr. A. P. Macdonald.

NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY.

On the item of \$31,000 for Nova Scotia Railway,

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for information and on

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explaining the work to be done.

The item passed.

NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY.

Item of \$213,800 for European and North American, New Brunswick and Eastern Extension Railways.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained the purposes to which the vote was proposed to be applied, and

The item passed.

HALIFAX TERMINUS.

Item for \$150,000 for extension of Railway Terminus to Halifax.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the Intercolonial would end at Richmond, some 2½ miles outside Halifax, and it was proposed to carry it into the city.

Item passed.

CANAL COMMISSION.

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the report of the Canal Commission would be before the House early in the ensuing week.

HARBOURS AND PIERS.

Item of \$326,000 for Harbours and Piers.

Mr. MACKENZIE complained that some of the contracts had not been given to the lowest tender.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained that the lowest tender for the Rondeau Harbour had been accepted. The same contractor, however, made the lowest tender for the Goderich Harbour, and the Government thought the same man should not have the two works. They therefore gave the contract to the next lowest tenderer, he accepting it at the price of the lowest tender. The same was the case in the Chantry Island works, the Contractor who had received the Goderich Harbour contract was given to the next tenderer at the lowest price.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the explanation was most miserable, and the work had been apportioned to gratify political partisans.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the Government had taken on themselves the responsibility of disregarding tenders, and making private bargains with their friends. He thought the case a very bad one indeed.

Mr. OLIVER said that he found from the papers produced, that the Engineer of the Department had recommended the lowest tender in each case, and he did not know why the Minister had not acted on his recommendation.

Mr. STEPHENSON said that no one for a moment doubted Mr. Brown's ability to perform whatever work he contracted for; but this one thing could be said: At the time these tenders were opened, there was a strong feeling expressed in opposition to the Government allowing one man to have a monopoly of the works for which tenders had been called, and he (Mr. S.) had received letters from various sections of the country, making complaints on this score when it was believed Mr. Brown was likely to get the contracts for the construction of both the Rondeau Harbour and the Harbour at Goderich; and, moreover, several of the strongest of these complaints came from political friends of the member for West Durham. As the contracts now stood, he (Mr. S.) believed that Mr. Brown was perfectly satisfied; he, at all events, presumed so from the fact that Mr. Stephenson was aware that Mr. Brown had expressed himself as being indifferent so far as the Rondeau was concerned, as to whether he did the pier, stone and iron work or not, so long as he had the dredging, which was what he now was to perform at the Rondeau as well as at Goderich. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MERRITT regretted exceedingly that the lowest tenders had not been accepted.

After some further discussion, in which Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Street, and Mr. Workman took part,

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the Government considered that no contractor should have more than one of the works. It had been said that political partisanship had existed. Such was not the case. Item was passed.

The Committee reported progress, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER stated that to-morrow the estimates would be continued.

The House adjourned at 1 a. m.

FRIDAY, 24th March, 1871.

After routine,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER brought down returns of Orders in Council issued relative to the Fisheries, and a statement of the means adopted by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to prevent sawdust and rub-

bish from being thrown into rivers frequented by fish, &c.

Mr. SHANLY introduced a Bill concerning the Vandreuil Company.

Mr. WORKMAN introduced a Bill to amend the charter of the Sun Insurance Company.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY introduced a Bill relating to the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said, in reference to a petition which he had presented to-day relative to the archives of Canada, that the object of the literary gentlemen whose names were attached to it, was to preserve all public documents which would be useful as records of the history of the country. He spoke at some length of the necessity of preserving these documents. He therefore moved that the petition be referred to the Joint Committee on the Library.

Hon. Mr. DORION hoped that steps would be taken to arrange and preserve the papers referred to.

Mr. O'CONNOR introduced a Bill to incorporate the Board of Trade of the Town of Windsor.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice that he would on Tuesday next move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for an address to Her Majesty on the subject of the draft of a Bill intended for submission to the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT complained that the draft of the Bill was not submitted with the papers.

After some further discussion the subject was dropped.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS gave notice that he would on Tuesday next submit a resolution to the House to empower the Government to treat with the Ontario Government for the sale or lease of the Rockwood Asylum.

FORTIFICATIONS.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON, before going into Committee of Supply asked whether the Government intended to Act upon the power they possessed to expend money on fortifications during the approaching Parliamentary recess, or whether they were prepared to assure Parliament that no steps looking to an expenditure under the appropriation Act of 1868 would be taken until this Parliament should again meet at its next session. He was persuaded that the all but unanimous feeling of the country was averse to any expenditure being undertaken under the existing Acts.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government had considered the question

and had come to the conclusion that they would not expend any money under the power granted them during the recess, and at the next session if they intended to do anything they would inform the House of it (cheers). He was glad that he had elicited cheers from the Opposition, (laughter).

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. STREET in the chair.

The item of \$5,000 for the protection to Little Hope light house was carried.

PUBLIC AND PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the details of expenditure on the Departmental and Parliament Buildings, some discussion took place.

Mr. MACKENZIE complained of the inefficient manner in which the public buildings were heated. Any one who had the misfortune to sit in this Legislative Chamber knew that it could only be done at the risk of health from drafts. He believed that the Government deserved credit for having resisted the claim of Mr. Garth for \$37,000 for heating the buildings. The system is the most inefficient and costly one that could have been adopted. It was the natural result, however, of employing men to look after it, not because they were fitted for the business, but because they were Government partisans.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the Government had decided to enquire into the matter, and would endeavor to obtain a more economical system. The present cost of heating the buildings was \$30,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE was confident that the object might be obtained for one third of the amount.

Item carried.

LIBRARY BUILDING.

Item for \$50,000 for Library Building.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Building would be finished by November next.—Carried.

TOWER AND GROUNDS.

Item of \$207,000 for Tower, Railings, Grounds, &c., of Parliament Buildings.

Hon. LANGEVIN said the object of the vote was to complete the whole work. The tower would be completed, and it was desirable that a proper fence should be erected and the grounds put in proper order. The fence would be erected during the year 1871-72.

Hon. Mr. McDUGALL asked whether plans had been decided upon.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN answered in the negative, and said that when the plans

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

were decided on, they would be laid before the House.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked whether the sums asked would cover all expenses.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he could not say positively, but did not think much more would be required. The amounts were to cover the costs of construction and not of repairs. The Tower was to be completed with wood and iron, not stone. Tenders had not yet been called for—as Engineers had thought it advisable not to finish the Tower at once. The Tower had now settled equally and would be able to be completed.

Item passed.

HALIFAX PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Item of \$200,000 for Post Office, Custom House, and other Public Buildings at Halifax.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the Government should fully explain the circumstances of this vote, in connection with the Provincial Buildings already erected at Halifax.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the Government did not possess those buildings, and it was absolutely necessary that the Government should have buildings at Halifax. The Government would be glad to receive those buildings, but the Local Government refused to hand them over. The claim of that Government had never been decided to be inadmissible but nothing could be done until the buildings were handed over.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) gave notice that he should move an amendment on the item coming up for concurrence. The building had been constructed to accommodate a large number of Government Departments, partly belonging to the Local, and partly belonging to the Dominion Government. The Local Government might, therefore, well have asked for half the entire cost of construction, but had only asked for the expenditure since Confederation. The building had been constructed most economically, the Contractors barely covering their outlay. The Local Government took the ground that as the work had been originally started for Local objects the Dominion Government should share the expense. He believed the Government of Nova Scotia had offered to give up the building on terms unfair to her own people, and that instead of asking \$66,000, they ought to have asked \$100,000 or half the entire cost. If the Dominion Government did not meet the proposition of the Local Government, and accept the building on the terms offered, they would have to go to much larger expenditure in constructing buildings of their own. They would

have to pay more, and would have to wait three or four years for a building to accommodate services for which the Provincial building had been expressly constructed. He thought no new building should be commenced until the negotiations between the two Governments were concluded. He contended the matter was one of open and unadjusted account between the two Governments, and the Government had no right to retain the \$10,000 for interest. The Government of Nova Scotia having constructed the building for objects which were now partly under the Dominion Government, their claim was more than just, for they had a right to receive either one half the entire cost, or retain one half of the building.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the Dominion Government were required by law to charge interest on the cost of the building so long as it was not handed over, and they had no other course open to them. The first step to be taken was for the Local Government to hand over the building, and he would then be prepared to recommend that the matter should be referred to arbitration, and the Government would ask Parliament for any amount decided by the Arbitrators.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the Government could not persist in asking the vote, which was for the sole reason of coercing the people of Nova Scotia. If the Government was right, why not wait till the elections in Nova Scotia had taken place, and the new Local Parliament had expressed its views of the matter.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER, said it was of no consequence for what the buildings were constructed, or whether they came within purview of the Union Act, because the Government of Nova Scotia entirely repudiated these grounds in their correspondence. The Government claimed the sum of \$66,000, for the reason expressly stated that that money was expended since Confederation out of Provincial funds. Under the Union Act the building became a Dominion building, and ought to have been ceded to the Dominion Government. The Local Government, however, passed a minute that they would hold the building until the question of Confederation was settled. On the granting of the subsidy the Dominion made a condition that that subsidy should be chargeable with five per cent interest on the cost of construction of the building, until it should be handed over. If the claim of Nova Scotia had been admitted, a further claim of \$300,000 would have been urged under precisely similar circumstances. The admission would have established a principle that

would have opened the way to numbers of similar claims from every Province. The Dominion Government were absolutely precluded by the Union Act from admitting the claim on which it was urged by the Local Government. If the statement of the member for Halifax was correct the Nova Scotia Government had done themselves great injustice in stating their case. The action of the Nova Scotia Government had been most extraordinary; they ought to have given up the building under protest, and stated their determination to sustain their claim.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked the hon. President of the Council to explain the grounds on which the appropriation was asked.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER was glad he had satisfied the honorable member for Chateauguay on every other point, and would be able to satisfy him as to the appropriation before he took his seat. The interest charged was upon a statement made by the Local Government itself, and the moment they stated that the cost had been less, the interest had been charged on the smaller amount. The people of Halifax were especially suffering from the want of a post office, and the custom house also was altogether inadequate to the requirements, the Government therefore were anxious not to lose a year, in order that, if Nova Scotia still determined to hold the building, they would be in a position at once to supply the buildings required. They would not, however, take any steps until the people of Nova Scotia had decided at the ensuing elections whether they would sustain the action of the government.

Mr. SAVARY thought the item should pass so that the Government might be in a position to supply the buildings required. The Government of Nova Scotia in retaining the building had already lost half the sum they claimed, and if they maintained their position for a few more years, they would have sacrificed the whole amount. He referred to the correspondence before the House, showing that the Minister of Finance had made the fairest promises as to the settlement of the account in the event of the Building being transferred, but the Local Government would not meet that of the Dominion in the matter. He asked whether the Local Government had furnished a detailed statement of their claim. (Sir F. Hincks—they have not yet.) He hoped to see the building handed over, but did not care to whom it belonged so that the public might have the advantage of using it. He would be sorry to defend any injustice to the people of Nova Scotia, but he would consider it a humiliation to that people if they should ask for anything

to which they had not a just right. He referred to the passing of the clause providing the charge of interest on the cost of the Building and charged the member for West Durham with having been mainly instrumental in passing that clause, and maintained that if the Government had referred the matter to Arbitration, and the Arbitrators had granted the whole claim, that member would have been foremost in condemning such a proceeding.

Mr. BLAKE replied to the reference to himself, shewing that the clause had been adopted by 126 votes out of 132, that the Government themselves had adopted and supported the clause, and how therefore could he, then an insignificant member of the Opposition, be charged with having overborne the Government and brought about the adoption of the clause. He would not call the attack made upon him by the member for Digby cowardly, but he would say that the way in which the Government had, in correspondence with the Local Government, tried to shift upon him and others of the Opposition the responsibility of the course pursued was cowardly.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

PRIVATE AND LOCAL BILLS.

The following Private and Local Bills were read a second time, passed through Committee of the Whole, and read a third time:—

Act to incorporate the Confederation Life Association [as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce]—Mr. Young.

Act to incorporate the Toronto Corn Exchange Association [as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce]—Mr. Beaty.

Act to amend and explain the Act to amend the Charter of the Ontario Bank [as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce]—Hon. Mr. Cameron [Peel.]

Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company [as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines]—Mr. Crawford [Leeds.]

Act to incorporate the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company [as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines]—Mr. Macdonald [Glengarry.]

Mr. CRAWFORD moved the second reading of Bill No. 2—An Act to amend the Act 31st Victoria, chapter 11, entitled

Mr. Savary.

“An Act respecting Banks,” and also to amend the Act 33rd Victoria, chapter 11, entitled “An Act respecting Banks and Banking.”—[Hon. Mr. Abbott.]—Carried.

The Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

SUPPLY.

HALIFAX PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The House resumed the debate on the Public Buildings at Halifax, in Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAKE continued to argue that the Dominion Government should have endeavoured to induce the Nova Scotia Government to enter into negotiations for the transfer of the Buildings. He believed that it was for political purposes that they failed to do this. It was to create a bridge by which hon. members sitting on the Opposition might cross to the Government side that the Ministry refused to perform their plain duty, and entered upon what was obviously an abortive effort to settle the difficulty.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY begged to correct the hon. member. The leader of the Government had endeavoured in good faith to have the difficulty settled.

Mr. JONES [Halifax] said when the leader of the Dominion Government was in Halifax, representatives of Nova Scotia asked if the Dominion Government had any proposition to make with reference to the dispute between them, and the Dominion Government said they had not.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the Minister of the Dominion Government had not, because he was not there in a position to make such a settlement, but he told them to send their representatives to Ottawa, and efforts would be made to settle the difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE said if so, the Minister of Justice, two years ago, did not say so, when he [Mr. Blake] said it was the plain duty of the Government to have approached the Government of Nova Scotia, and not merely to have formally approached them, but to have made every effort in their power to induce them to enter into negotiation, and he [Mr. Blake] said further, that unless the House had proof that such had been done, this Government was plainly guilty of a dereliction of duty and that there was no proof that any such effort had been made.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER and Hon. Dr. TUPPER explained that Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Macdougall during the convention in Halifax had extended an invitation to the Government of Nova Scotia to send their Finance Minister

to Ottawa for the purpose of settling the difficulty.

Mr. MACDONALD, (Lunenburg), corroborated this statement.

Messrs. CARMICHAEL, and ROSS, (Victoria), supported the statement of Mr. Jones that no such effort had been made to their knowledge. They most distinctly understood that the Dominion Government had no proposition to make.

Mr. BLAKE said there was no documents to prove that the Dominion Government had made any effort to settle the question. The only written evidence that could be furnished was that the Government had negotiated with Hon. Mr. Howe in reference to entering into negotiations directly with the Nova Scotia Government. The necessary result of this, was that the views of the people of Nova Scotia were not represented in the settlement, and they felt irritated and insulted at the manner in which they had been treated. If the negotiations had been concluded with the Representatives of Nova Scotia, the people would, no doubt, have been satisfied. The House was now called upon to pay \$200,000 for buildings, and the House was called upon to support the domineering act of the Ministry over the Government of Nova Scotia. Mr. Blake here read from a speech, delivered by Hon. Dr. Tupper in Nova Scotia, in which that hon. gentleman had stated that Nova Scotia had received since 1867, \$97,000 more than she had contributed to the revenue, and thus had not aided to the extent of one dollar in defraying the cost of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, he [Mr. Blake] would ask was this true? If so he would not be afraid to justify his course two years ago in relation to the fifth clause, even before a Nova Scotia audience. He explained at considerable length the course which he had then taken and the grounds on which he had acted as he did.

Hon. Col. GREY had almost been inclined to say, let Nova Scotia have what she claimed if that would satisfy and do away with the complaints. The question was, however, whether the Government could have taken any course other than they had done. The member for West Durham had directed all his arguments to the condemnation of what was done before the passing of the Act, but the Bill had been deliberately passed and the Government were obliged to be governed by it, and they were tied down to a particular rule, without any of the latitude allowed in many other cases. The wishes of Nova Scotia should receive every consideration, but when that had been done nothing further could be allowed, for the Government were the servants of the Dominion

Parliament and not of the Nova Scotia Legislature. The House must see that the views of the member for Halifax could not be entertained. He believed the question was one for equitable settlement, and he did not doubt that such a settlement could readily be arrived at. In the present state of the law the Government had only one course open to them, until the buildings were handed over. In addition to the clause providing for the charging of the interest, another clause enacted that the provisions of that Act, and of the "British North America Act of 1867," should be taken in full settlement of all demands on Canada by Nova Scotia. As to why arbitration had not been called in, the first Minister of the Crown had answered that the Government had no power to employ arbitration. When the buildings had been handed over no one could doubt that the Government would deal with the matter justly and equitably in every way, and if they did not do so they would incur the censure of this House. The law would not allow of any action now, but when the buildings were ceded and the matter came up, every one in the House would be anxious to see full justice done.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL thought it would be a great loss and a great waste of money to have two buildings at Halifax, and certainly it was most undignified to pass a vote for the sole reason of intimidating and coercing the people of Nova Scotia, to make them relinquish the position they had assumed. On these two grounds he was opposed to the vote, and he certainly thought there ought to be easy means of enabling the Dominion Government to get possession of what belonged to it, without recourse to arbitration or any other roundabout means. The question ought to be thoroughly enquired into, and it should be ascertained whether the statement of the member for Halifax that the building was erected for purposes, a part only of which came within the power of the Dominion, was correct, and if such should be the case, the matter should be adjusted on that basis. The Union Act provided that Nova Scotia should come in with a debt of \$8,000,000, paying interest on any sum in excess of that amount. She was, however, indebted beyond that amount, but she was not liable for interest on liabilities over that amount, but for matters of debt only. It appeared to him that the additional subsidy granted to Nova Scotia was intended in full settlement of all claims by Nova Scotia, including the expenditure on the building. As to any sum that might have been expended on furniture, that might be dealt with as out-

side the binding terms of the Act. As far however, as the main sum was concerned, there could be no doubt that it was governed by the terms of the Act, and the Government had no power to act otherwise than in accordance with the law. He was opposed to the vote, as it was simply coercive, and was not intended to be made use of.

Mr. MACKENZIE could not agree with the statement of the President of the Council as regarded the amount on which interest had been charged. The Nova Scotia Government had at first named the amount they claimed for principal and interest, but afterwards named the exact cost when they found they were to be charged with interest, but they had not in any way attempted misrepresentation, as the President of the Council had tried to show. He referred to the action of the Opposition with respect to Nova Scotia at the time of Confederation, to show that the Opposition had then stood by Nova Scotia, and showed every disposition to give her full justice. The Province of Nova Scotia had not been well used in the correspondence that had taken place, and the money expended by Nova Scotia since Confederation on this building ought to have been paid by the Dominion Government. If part of the building had been designed for local services, the Government could not claim the whole of it. He referred to the construction of the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa, and said that the amount spent, under the old contracts, since Confederation had been borne by the Dominion, and the same rule should be followed in the case of the building at Halifax.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that he had seen in the hands of the Auditor, statements showing that every dollar expended on the Parliament buildings under contracts in force at the time of Confederation was charged against the old Province of Canada. If the statement of the member for Lambton was correct, Nova Scotia would be enabled to claim hundreds of thousands of dollars expended under similar circumstances.

Mr. MCKENZIE condemned the Government for attempting coercive measures, and said that the matter should be fully and fairly considered, and settled equitably, but he could not consent to the vote being passed simply to ascertain the views of the people of Nova Scotia. Mr. Rose had frankly admitted that the amount expended since Confederation stood on a different basis to that expended prior to that time, and had said that that matter might form subject for equitable adjustment, and that equitable adjustment was exactly what he desired.

Hon. Mr Macdougall.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the whole tone of the correspondence shewed the readiness of the Dominion Government to decide the matter equitably and amicably, but hon. gentlemen could not deny that there was some ground for deeming that the matter was not one simply of account. The Government had considered the matter to be entirely on the same footing as the Railway matter, which had been charged against Nova Scotia without objection. Honorable gentlemen seemed very sensitive as respects their former action concerning Nova Scotia, and seemed most anxious to set themselves right with that Province. He could not see any cause for the indignant expressions used by the member for West Durham, as regarded references to him in the correspondence as the only statement that could possibly apply to him was that the clause had been proposed by an opponent of the government and accepted by the government, and he could not understand how that could be termed a "cowardly attack." The Government was most anxious to dispose of the matter fairly, but it would be most dangerous to open the accounts, as it would open the way for claims for millions of dollars. The Government had most scrupulously adhered to the principle, that all debts and liabilities at the time of Confederation should be charged against the Provinces incurring them.

Hon. Mr. DORION asked whether the full amount of the cost of the building, including the \$66,000 made a part of the debt charged against Nova Scotia.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Certainly not.

Hon. Mr. DORION said that the sessional papers shewed, as forming part of the debt charged to Nova Scotia, a sum of \$22,000 for the Buildings.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the whole question was involved in the query of the member for Hochelaga. He stated most distinctly that not one farthing of the \$66,000 was included in or charged against the debt of Nova Scotia. The memorandum cited was not a statement of the actual debt, but a simple estimate, made beforehand by the auditor, of what that debt would be when all existing contracts were fulfilled.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the statement in the papers was most distinct that that amount was included in the debt.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS asked hon. gentlemen whether they could possibly believe or imagine that if that amount had been twice charged, Nova Scotia would have allowed such to be done. It was impossible that such could be the case.

Speaking of the vote, he distinctly denied that it was intended to be in any way coercive, but the necessity for the building was very great and the Dominion could not go on year after year until the Government of Nova Scotia chose to hand over the buildings. With these remarks he asked the Committee to support the vote.

Mr. BLAKE asked whether interest had been charged on the whole cost of the buildings.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—Certainly it had, the Act provided that such should be done, that Nova Scotia should pay five per cent. on the cost of the building until it was handed over, and the Dominion Government had no choice.

Mr. BLAKE maintained that the Act only intended that interest should be charged on the cost to the Dominion and not on the whole cost.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said that the Act certainly allowed of one course only being taken irrespective of questions of equity, and if the point had been raised at the time the clause was passed, the member for West Durham would have been the very last to admit the view he now advocated.

Hon. Mr. DORION was convinced that the Government of Nova Scotia would have handed over the building, if the Dominion Government had asked for, not demanded it. No doubt, the proper course would have been taken if it had not been for the approaching election. The vote asked for was wholly unjustifiable. It was not proposed to expend it, it was simply to be held out to the people of Nova Scotia as an inducement for them to send supporters of the Government to Parliament, or rather as a menace to force them to do so.

Hon. Mr. SMITH agreed with those who believed that it was intended to use this vote to coerce Nova Scotia into submission to this Government. He sustained the view that the Dominion was liable for the cost of the buildings, and should recoupe it to Nova Scotia.

Mr. SCATCHERD spoke at some length against the appropriation.

Mr. SAVARY said if this vote was withdrawn the effect of it would be to keep the buildings closed for a year longer. He could see no attempt at coercion in this appropriation. He believed a mode of meeting this difficulty would be found if the House would vote this money, but he did not see how it could be done without it. He had been charged with having used offensive language in referring to the hon. member for Lambton. He never intended to do so, but he had said before, and he

charged it now, that the party, of whom the hon. members for Lambton and Durham were the chief exponents, were endeavouring to fan the embers of the anti-confederate party into a flame to suit their own purposes (hear, hear). When he, with other representatives of Nova Scotia, came to this House and saw that the object of the Opposition was to create discord, he joined the Government party, who were desirous of promoting peace and harmony throughout the Dominion. The consequence was that the Opposition from Ontario opposed every measure brought down by the Government in the interest of Nova Scotia. It did not rest with the hon. member for Lambton to charge him (Mr. Savary) with being a slavish supporter of the Government. The action of the Opposition had resulted in excommunicating every Nova Scotia member from their ranks.

Mr. MILLS replied to the remarks of the hon. member for Digby, charging him with inconsistency. He (Mr. S.) had at one time used the most bitter language in speaking of the hon. member for Hants whose leadership he (Mr. Savary) now followed so faithfully. Mr. Mills continued to speak at some length against the vote. He characterized the course of the Government as shabby beyond measure in lending themselves to so ignoble a purpose as to aid the Opposition in the Nova Scotia Legislature. They entered into a contest with the Government of Nova Scotia before the people of that Province, and they had taken advantage of the Act passed two years since, to coerce the people of Nova Scotia. This was his reason for opposing the appropriation.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS thought the argument of the hon. member for West Durham most unfortunate for the country. If the construction of the hon. member for Westmoreland was correct as to the \$66,000 it would apply to every open account as incompleted work at the time of Confederation, and thus claims to the amount of millions might be brought against the Dominion. Thus if \$100 were spent on a public work before any Province entered the Union, of a work to cost five millions, the affirmation of this principle would cast this enormous responsibility on the Dominion. That \$66,000 being a liability of Nova Scotia at the Union, was properly chargeable to her. He denied this question could be treated as a matter of account, and that any similar claim had been treated in this way.

In reply to Mr. Scatcherd,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the settlement made by Mr. Howe on behalf of the Pro-

vince of Nova Scotia had been accepted by her Government, for they had received all the extra subsidy.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the grants and additional allowances had been accepted, but not the liabilities. If the people of Nova Scotia wanted the building for local purposes, they were welcome to it on our terms, and we claimed we must erect other buildings. That is our position.

Mr. CURRIER asked could the Local Government hand over the buildings when they liked?

Mr. BLAKE—Yes.

Mr. CURRIER—Then, after spending \$200,000 on a new building, the present one might be transferred, and this Dominion might find itself with two sets of buildings in its hands (Opposition cheers).

Hon. Mr. DORION said it was admitted that the buildings belonged to the Dominion Government, and they could hand them over to Canada whenever they pleased.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS wished to know if the honourable member for Hochelaga meant to say that the Government of Nova Scotia could keep those buildings for half a century if they pleased, and then force them on the Dominion Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said if it was admitted that the Dominion owned the buildings they could take possession of them at any time.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said Halifax must have suitable buildings like St. Johns, Montreal and other cities in the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON wished to know if the honorable member understood that the Dominion Government had not the power to eject the Nova Scotia Government from the buildings if they chose.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, most certainly not, if they pay the interest on them.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the Act established a penalty that so long as the Nova Scotia Government refused to surrender the buildings they were obliged to pay the interest.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the only true course was to get rid of the difficulty by coming to an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, in reply to Mr. Currier, said that the Government would not accept the buildings if they had to build new ones.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the Government might accept them or not, but the moment

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

that Nova Scotia refused to pay interest, the Dominion Government must pay over all the subsidy as if they had accepted the buildings.

Mr. BLAKE said it was as clear as the light, that if at any future time the Nova Scotia Government chose to give up the buildings, this Government could not refuse to accept them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax), in summing up the debate, said their was an impression in Nova Scotia that the Dominion Government would have settled this question long ago but for a member of the Cabinet professing to represent Nova Scotia in the Cabinet. He (Mr. Jones) gave notice that he would propose an amendment on concurrence which would have the effect of testing this question and of relieving this Government from an embarrassing position.

Mr. KILLAM opposed the vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for particulars of the character of the proposed building.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said other votes had been passed on precisely similar information. Plans had not been prepared, for the reason that though the Government thought it desirable to have a vote, they hoped the Nova Scotia Government would surrender the building.

Mr. MACKENZIE complained of the want of particulars, and said it proved the factious nature of the estimate.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER could not permit the gross misrepresentations of the hon. member for Lambton and others on his side of the House to go unanswered. He had been taunted with being incapable and incompetent and with having unfairly represented Nova Scotia. He had fought and done his best for Nova Scotia at Quebec, and would again accept Confederation on the same terms. The Conference at London improved the position of Nova Scotia, and the Ontario Opposition and newspapers denounced that small grant as a fraud on Ontario. When, however, the election in Nova Scotia resulted so unfavourably to Confederation, he had refused position and place in order to occupy the lower place in which he could help to remove the difficulties that had occurred. When the Government had grappled with the matter, and had brought down a measure to remove the difficulties, the Opposition had done their utmost to prevent that measure of conciliation from passing and then they had gone to the Legislature of Ontario, and convulsed that House with complaints of what was done for Nova Scotia, and the member for Lambton had gone from hustings to hustings denouncing the Government for its

measure of conciliation to Nova Scotia; and if that hon. member did not believe that he represented the views of Nova Scotia, he would prove it, and a strong corroboration was the fact of Mr. Mackenzie having in his support a man who had ever been hostile to Nova Scotia, who had insulted that Parliament by absenting himself for two sessions, and who had been heard to say that he would take off his hat and cheer were the British flag hauled down throughout Canada.

Mr. JONES—It is a deliberate untruth.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER quoted from a speech of Mr. Power, to the effect that the Opposition had ever been hostile to Nova Scotia—and that Nova Scotia had nothing to expect from a change of Government: The member for Lambton had said that he went into the Public Account Committee, and took good care to see that the amounts chargeable under the contracts for the Public Buildings should be paid by the Dominion, and if that was admitted Nova Scotia would claim \$600,000, instead of \$66,000, and all the members of the Opposition had so far forgotten their duty to the country as to make the baseless insinuation that the Government intended to do what they themselves wanted to do, to make the vote an election cry—and they had asked the Committee to tear the Union Act to tatters to give them political capital in Nova Scotia. The Dominion Government had sought in every possible manner consistent with the Union Act to obtain possession of the Buildings. The Legislature of Nova Scotia had expressed its determination to keep the Buildings, and the Government had said: "Do so, and we will provide other accommodation for the public services, and charge you the interest decided by Parliament,"—and if that were done the clause in the Act would be obliged to be repealed, but the Opposition desired to keep the people without Post Office and Custom House, and yet provided no means for solving the difficulty. The course of the Government has been one of the most delicate consideration. As to cost of buildings, the member for Halifax was a living and satisfactory evidence that the amount asked would be fully adequate.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg).—The circumstances referred to were that in August 1869 the Governor General proposed to make a tour through the Maritime Provinces, when some of the gentlemen of Halifax proposed that he should at least be welcomed to the city. A meeting was held at which a great amount of partizanship was shown. He had then moved a resolution for an address of welcome, and the member for Halifax then rose

and opposed anything being done in recognition of the visit. He did not, however, say he would cheer when the flag was pulled down, because the meeting would not allow him to do so. He, however, spoke in favour of annexation and said when that day came, and when the British flag was pulled down from Citadel Hill he would take off his hat (suited the action to the word) and—he was not allowed to finish his sentence by the roar of indignation that followed. He afterwards tried to resume his speech but was not allowed to do so.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON raised a point of order that the discussion had no connection with the vote, and called in the Speaker.

The SPEAKER ruled that the Chairman should decide points of order in Committee and the Chairman ruled Mr. McDonald in order.

Mr. McDONALD (Lunenburg) said that afterwards a report was published purporting to be an account of what the member for Halifax had said, and what had really been said was not stated, and he supposed the report was what the hon. gentleman would have said in cooler moments.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that if the President of the Council had desired to verify his statement, he should have appealed to some one more worthy of reliance. The City Council had refused to pass a vote of welcome, and a subsequent meeting had been held, and he held a printed statement of what he then said—to the effect that the Governor should receive every welcome due to a distinguished person, but that he should see that he came to a discontented people who considered themselves conquered. He denied that he had said he would cheer when the British flag was pulled down, but there were many who desired independence, and if he honestly desired that, he would be justified in greeting it with pleasure, but he denied the statement even in that sense. He had shown the House that on three occasions the President of the Council had not done his duty to his country, and if he (Mr. Jones) traded and trafficked on the interests of the country as that gentleman had done, he would be ashamed to show his face in that House.

Mr. MACKENZIE was amazed at the expressions of the President of the Council, but he had ever acted as the *claqueur* of his party, and stung as he must have been by the exposure of the contemptible policy of the Government, there was no wonder that he had availed himself of his powers of invective. That gentleman had said that he had made the treatment of Nova Scotia his chief election cry, but he

would refer him to his speeches in which he would not find a single reference to the subject.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER asked whether the hon. gentleman had not said that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were leeches on the other Provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had never said such a thing, and if any one said he had, they uttered a gross falsehood!

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD said when the hon. gentleman had finished, he would tell him he had said so.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the President of the Council had accused him of associating with men who would cheer when the British flag was pulled down. But with whom did he associate? Why he associated with a man who, at Fort Garry, had said "Take down that rag" and "wished to God that the Yankees had the country?" He himself had ever been careful of Nova Scotia, and repudiated everything the President of the Council had said on the subject.

Mr. BLAKE desired also to repudiate what had been said by the President of Council—he had not by a single word expressed any desire to "tear the Union Act to tatters," and the hon. gentleman, if he had not wilfully misrepresented, had at least shown great obtuseness in the construction he had placed on what had really been said.

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD said the member for Lambton had stated that he had not referred to the subject of the Lower Provinces in his electioneering speeches—but he had been pre-ent with him at Mount Brydges, Glencoe, Newbury, and other places, and he declared on each occasion that Nova Scotia got more money than she was entitled to, and all through the influence and votes of Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald, Mr. Wood, and Mr. A. P. Macdonald in the Dominion Parliament, and that the Lower Provinces were perfect leeches on the Dominion. He used the strongest terms—especially against Nova Scotia. In every meeting at which he had been present, the member for Lambton had brought up the money voted by the Dominion Parliament to Nova Scotia, and actually led the people of that country to believe that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would come for a large sum bye and bye, and that it was their bounden duty to send strong party men to the Local House, who approved of his views, because the Local House was entirely controlled by the Dominion Parliament. He had also stated that the Dominion Government had thrown away not \$8,000,000, but \$12,000,000, so increasing the amount as he got to small places and

away from reporters, and that the Intercolonial Railway Commissioners were going to build a switch $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long to benefit a member of the Government, and had thrown away a large sum of money in changing the route. He was perfectly willing to vote the amount of the estimate because he believed it just and right to do so, but he thought the member for Lambton had got very patriotic all at once, for while he was in Ontario, Nova Scotia was nothing, but the moment he came back, when he thought he could gain support, he turned round and said she should have \$66,000. The hon. member might deny that he had made these statements, and might bring his friends to shew that he had not, but he (Mr. McDonald) could produce the most substantial men in the country to bear out what he had said.

Mr. MACKENZIE entirely denied having made the statements respecting Nova Scotia and New Brunswick attributed to him, and he could appeal to all who knew him to say whether he had ever been guilty of prevarication. The record of his speeches was in the newspapers, and he would scorn to make a statement in the smallest place that he was not prepared to substantiate in his seat in Parliament.

The item was then carried.

On the motion of Hon. Sir F. HINCKS, the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again on Tuesday, the report to be received on Monday.

SAVINGS BANKS.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the second reading of Bill No. 46, "An Act respecting certain Saving's Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec," and that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—Carried.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER gave notice that on Tuesday he would present the resolutions respecting the admission of British Columbia into Confederation.

The House adjourned at 2:05 a. m.

Mr. Mackenzie.

MONDAY, March 27th, 1871.

After routine,

On motion for a third reading of a Bill to incorporate the Frederickton and St. Mary's Bridge Company, a discussion arose as to whether the Local Legislature of New Brunswick should deal with the measure.

The third reading was postponed till tomorrow.

ILLEGAL MARRIAGES.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to remove doubts as to the legality of certain marriages."

Mr. MACKENZIE thought this question of so much importance that before the hon. member proceeded further, he should explain the objects of the Bill. It was too important a question to proceed with until the House knew the facts.

Mr. BOWELL had no objection to explain the provisions of this Bill though he thought it better to wait until the second reading of the Bill. Chapter 72 of the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada provides that "no minister or clergyman shall celebrate the ceremony of marriage, between any two persons unless duly authorized so to do by license under the hand and seal of the Governor," and by a subsequent Act "by license under the hand and seal of a deputy appointed to sign said license, or by publishing the bonds," etc. In some parts of the former Province of Upper Canada, now Ontario, Issuers of Marriage Licenses who were applied to for licenses had given the party so applying, a writing or document to the clergyman, informing him that he might celebrate the ceremony of marriage, under such writing or document, and that so soon as licenses properly signed by the Governor or his Deputy were received, he would issue one in place of the certificate issued. Clergymen had married persons with no other authority than those certificates. In some cases duly and properly signed licenses have been substituted for these certificates, while in others, he had been informed, they were not. Some lawyers, eminent in their profession, contend that these marriages are not void nor voidable; while others declare them to be not only voidable but absolutely void. Others again declare them to be legal, until pronounced void by a competent Court. Families have grown up, and are now growing up, the issue of such marriages; and since the facts have become known the parents of these families have been troubled with doubts as to the legitimacy of their children in the

strict letter and interpretation of the law. It is to legalize such marriages the present Bill is introduced. The House, he was sure, would concur in the opinion, that whether these marriages were legal, illegal, void or voidable it was not only proper but necessary to set the question at rest, and remove all doubts in the minds of persons who had been innocently placed in such a position. He knew there was a doubt as to the jurisdiction of this House to deal with the question. He was desirous of having this point settled, so that if he could not go on with the Bill it could be taken to the Local Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE called the attention of the Government to the constitutional point involved in the question before the House.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that the ministers who solemnized these marriages must have been aware of the nature of the certificates that were handed to them, and they must have been guilty of great neglect to have allowed the matter to lie so long unsettled.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the parties having acted in good faith should have their marriages legalized. Their children too should be protected by a special Act since the law had failed to protect them.

The Bill was read a first time.

CANAL COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN presented a copy of the instructions issued to the Canal Commissioners, together with the report of that body. He said the printed report would be distributed to members in a short time.

THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. PAQUET asked whether it is the intention of the Government to consider the North Shore Railway, as well as the Northern Colonization Railway between Montreal and Aylmer, as a part or link between the Intercolonial Railway and that projected in British Columbia, as well as that to Manitoba, which the Government is to construct at its own expense; and whether in view for the advantage which the Federal Government will derive therefrom especially in the transport of Her Majesty's troops in the case of invasion, &c., &c., it is proposed to recommend to His Excellency to grant them assistance, whether by an allowance of so much a mile or in a round sum, and in that way granting the prayer of the petitions now before them?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN took exception to the ground taken by the hon. member that the Government would construct the

Pacific Railway themselves. In reply to the first and second questions, he replied in the negative. The Government regarded the railway as a Provincial work.

POSTAGE ON AGRICULTURAL NEWS-PAPERS.

Mr. GENDRON asked whether it is the intention of the Government to abolish the postage on Agricultural newspapers published in the several Provinces of the Dominion, in order to encourage the circulation of such newspapers, and to place them within the reach of all farmers who wish to keep themselves informed of the progress of agriculture.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—It is not the intention of the Government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) asked whether the engineers now employed on the Intercolonial Railway will hereafter act as Inspectors of fences and ties; or whether some other persons will be appointed as such, and if so, what are the names of those persons?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the engineers now employed on the Intercolonial would act as inspectors.

CANADA GAZETTE.

Mr. FOURNIER asked whether it is by order of the Government that the *Canada Gazette* is no longer sent to the Reverend Cures and to the Registrars in the Province of Quebec?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that in compliance with the expressed wish of the House to conduct the *Canada Gazette* in the most economical manner they could, it was distributed to as few persons as possible.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET asked whether it is the intention of the Government to cause the Civil Service Act to be so amended as to exempt persons in the employment of the Federal Government from the Income Tax imposed by Municipal Corporations.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said it was not the intention of Government.

NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY SUPPLIES.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) asked whether it is the intention of the Government to solicit Tenders for supplies required for the use of the Nova Scotia Railways, or whether they intend following the course

Hon. Mr. Langevin.

hitherto pursued of obtaining the same by private contract?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that whenever Government deemed it expedient to solicit Tenders, they would do so.

ILLEGAL SEIZURE BY AMERICAN AUTHORITIES.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved for copies of correspondence, &c., relative to the seizure by United States Customs officials of a steam tug and barge, the property of Hiram Little, Esq., a British Subject, while engaged in legitimate trade in Canadian waters.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the correspondence was still going on.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL, DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS, &c.

Mr. MILLS moved a resolution declaring it expedient that Orders in Council, Departmental Regulations and Proclamations of a permanent character having the force of law be printed each year in the same manner as the Statutes of Canada.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER suggested that the matter should be referred to the committee on Printing to ascertain what would be the expense of carrying out the proposal.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he thought the hon. mover had contemplated that the Orders in Council &c., should be printed and bound up with the statutes.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN thought the expense would be fully met by the amount now expended on useless and promiscuous advertising.

Mr. GIBBS [Oshawa] had experienced great inconvenience from the difficulty in obtaining access to such documents, and thought it very important that they should be published.

Hon. Col. GRAY said that as the resolution was so worded as to include only Orders in Council &c., having force of law, it should certainly be carried out.

Hon. Mr. SMITH thought the resolution should include all orders already passed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government had no objection to the resolution *per se* but were very willing that the information should be published, but he thought it would be better first to let the expense be ascertained by the Printing Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE [Lambton] thought the Printing Committee could not possibly estimate the cost except on full information from the Government as to the num-

ber of Orders in Council to be printed, and that the Government themselves could better obtain the information from the Queen's Printer.

Sir GEO. E. CARTIER undertook to obtain the information as suggested, and Mr. Mills allowed the motion to stand:

PENSION LISTS.

Hon. Mr. BOLTON (Charlotte) moved for an order of the House for a statement of the settlement by capitalization of the several liabilities of each Province on Pension Lists prior to the Union.—Carried.

JOSEPH BOUCHETTE.

Mr. FORTIN (Gaspé) moved an address to His Excellency for copies of Petition or Petitions presented by Joseph Bouchette.—Carried.

ACADIA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved an address to His Excellency for copies of correspondence between the Government and this Company respecting the substitution of Dominion Bonds in place of lost Provincial Debentures. He said that since placing the motion on the paper, he had heard that proceedings were in progress for making the exchange desired, and asked if such was the case.

Hon. Sir. F. HINCKS said there was no doubt that the Bonds had really been lost on board the *City of Boston* as alleged, and the Government had at first been prepared to grant new Bonds, on receiving the usual security, which the Company had, of course, always been willing to furnish; but a difficulty had originated in the Department of Justice as to the power of the Government to issue Dominion Bonds in place of Provincial Debentures, and the Government were therefore prepared to redeem Bonds by paying the amount of their value, instead of replacing them by Dominion Bonds.

Mr. JONES pointed out that when the lost debentures had been purchased they had stood at a considerable premium, and that therefore if they were redeemed at their par value only, the company would sustain some loss.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that the Government from their other transactions were always acquainted with the exact value of the bonds, and were prepared to redeem them at their current value.

Mr. JONES then withdrew his motion.

PREMIUM NOTES TAKEN BY INSURANCE COMPANIES.

On the motion of Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT

(in the absence of Mr. R. A. Harrison) the House went into Committee on Bill No. 27, an Act to remove doubts as to the liability to stamp duties of premium notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.

Mr. MILLS in the chair.

Mr. YOUNG (South Waterloo) said that some objection had been raised to the Bill by Mutual Insurance Companies, as they considered they should not have to affix a stamp for the whole amount of the note, when they only received a portion of the amount. The Bill further provided that they should affix double to all notes at present in their possession and not stamped. He did not think this provision was right, as the companies had not acted in contravention of the law, and should not therefore be obliged to pay double duty. Many companies held such notes to a large amount, and if the Bill passed would have to pay a very heavy sum.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said that as to the first objection raised by the hon. member it certainly could not be acceded to. Although the whole amount of the premium was not paid at once, yet additional instalments were subsequently paid, and the stamp must be affixed in accordance with the face value. As to the companies acting in ignorance of the law in not affixing stamps to their notes, he believed a case had been taken into Court on that ground, and the Judge decided that these premium notes were promissory notes and should be stamped as such.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said there was a question whether notes taken by Mutual Insurance Companies were promissory notes, or merely agreements to pay money under certain contingencies.

Mr. BLAKE said the form of the Bill was to declare documents, that might not now be considered promissory notes, to be promissory notes.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he would like it to be observed that the Committee admitted that the Bill imposed an extra tax.

Hon. Mr. J. C. ABBOTT, said he wished it to be distinctly understood that he admitted nothing of the kind. He had merely moved the Bill in the absence of the member for Toronto West, believing that there would be no objection to it, but he was not prepared to discuss it, and therefore moved that the Committee should rise and allow the Bill to stand.

The Committee then rose, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

NORTH WEST TERRITORY.

The adjourned debate on the motion of

Mr. BLAKE,—That the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the admission of Rupert's Land and the North Western territory into the Union, and the legislation in reference to the same; the motion of the Hon. Sir George E. Cartier in amendment thereto, and the motion of the Hon. Mr. Dorion in amendment to the said amendment, was then resumed.

Mr. BLAKE said that the point under discussion on the adjournment of the previous debate was whether the amendment of the member for Hochelaga was in order. He maintained that it differed substantially from the motion he had proposed and was entirely in order.

The SPEAKER ruled it in order, as not being equivalent to the first motion.

Hon. Mr. DORION'S amendment was then put with the following result: Yeas, 55; Nays, 77.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Cameron (Huron), Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Coupal, Crawford, (Leeds), Delorme, Dorion, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Grover, Holton, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, Killam, McFarlane, MacKenzie, McCallum, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. K.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Scrivner, Smith, Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), Whitehead, Young—55.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Brousseau, Burton, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Currier, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Hincks (Sir Francis), Hurdon, Jackson, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Renaud, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Wilson, Wright (Ottawa County)—77.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER'S amendment was then put and the vote was as follows: Yeas, 78; Nays 57—majority 21.

YEAS—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Brousseau, Burton, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Currier, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Hincks (Sir Francis), Hurdon, Jackson, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald, (Lunenburg), McDonald, (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall, (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau,

Mr. Blake.

Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Wilson and Wright (Ottawa County).—78.

NAYS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Cameron (Huron), Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Coupal, Crawford (Leeds), Delorme, Dorion, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Grover, Holton, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, Killam, McFarlane, MacKenzie, McCallum, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. K.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Scrivner, Smith, Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), Whitehead and Young.—57.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. WHYTE, the newly elected member for East Hastings, in the place of Mr. Read, recently appointed to the Senate, was introduced by Hon. Sir Francis Hincks and Hon. Mr. Morris, and took his seat.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN resumed the debate on the Resolutions of Mr. Blake, as amended by Hon. Sir George E. Cartier. He (Mr. Anglin) continued his protest against the principle advocated by the Minister of Militia. When the Union Act was framed it was regarded as something to be unchangeable except by the Imperial Parliament, and only then at the request of the people of Canada as expressed through their representatives. Now, however, the Government were found applying to the Imperial Parliament for a change without ever having consulted this House. They all knew what the result would be. Whether acceptable to this Parliament or not, it would be made irrevocable law. Hon. members should look closely at this measure under discussion. They propose to so alter the law as to take certain powers out of the hands of the Imperial Government and assume them themselves. The Act was framed as though it was to defy the people, and the Government merely chose to inform them what they had done when demanded by this House. He doubted very much whether the House would have voted down the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga if they had considered it carefully before hand. It was virtually placing this House at the feet of the Government. He had no idea that a majority in this House could have sustained a proposition which would make the representatives of the people mere automatons. But if the House would assent to it, he doubted if they had a right to do so without first appealing to the people. If the constitution did not provide such a safeguard, then some protection should be afforded to the people against these amendments in the Confederation Act. Admitting his views to be

extreme, he could not understand how hon. gentlemen could stand up, and vote that the Government were right in seeking for a change of some of the most important provisions of the Constitution without, at least, having first consulted Parliament on the subject. He hoped, while there was yet time, this House would declare that our constitution was too sacred a thing to be altered without being fully discussed by the representatives of the people.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON moved that the resolution be amended by adding the following words: "And this House is of opinion that no changes in the provisions of the British North America Act should be sought for by the executive Government without the previous assent of the Parliament of this Dominion." He could add little to the able speech of the hon. member for Gloucester.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the Government could have no objection to accepting the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Chateaugay.

Mr. MILLS said, in ordinary legislation, if the House did not fairly represent public opinion, their successors after the following elections could amend anything which should be found objectionable to the people. But in this case it was different. The constitution was to be amended in such a way that this House would be unable to undo any mischief which that amendment might produce. It was therefore necessary to proceed with extreme caution. Looking at the resolutions, however, he observed that the House was asked by them to declare that they were entirely in favor of the address—an address which had never been submitted to them for their consideration. Then the measure provided that "the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba shall be Lieutenant Governor of the North West Territory." Now, under this provision, if the North West should be divided into forty Provinces, the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba would continue to be the Lieutenant Governor of the whole of them for all time to come. Other unalterable measures were also proposed. When the Manitoba Act was passed it was to meet the peculiar circumstances which prevailed in that Province at the time, and to enable the Government to restore peace there. It was only for this reason that it had obtained the assent of a majority in this House, and it was only regarded as a temporary measure, to be replaced by a better matured Act at some subsequent time. But the Government proposed to take advantage of this assent

of Parliament to a temporary measure, to make it unalterable. Now, if this principle were once recognized, what safeguard had the other Provinces against having their rights invaded in the future? He would vote against establishing such a dangerous principle.

A vote was then taken on the amendment which was,

Yeas, 137; Nays none.

YEAS—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowell, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Burpee, Burton, Cameron (Huron), Carling, Carmichael, Caron, Cartier (Sir Geo. E.), Cartwright, Chauveau, Cheval, Chipman, Cimon, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Delorme, Dobbie, Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Ferris, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alex. T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrin, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Gray, Grover, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holton, Hurdon, Jackson, Joly, Jones, (Leeds and Grenville), Keeler, Kempt, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald, (Middlesex), MacFarlane, MacKenzie, Masson, (Soulages), Masson (Terrebonne), McCallum, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, McMillan, McMonies, Merritt, Mills, Morris, Morison, (Victoria, O.), Morison [Niagara], Munroe, Oliver, Paquet, Pearson, Pelletier, Perry, Pironneault, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N.S.), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Ryan (King's, N.B.), Ryan (Montreal West), Rymal, Scatcherd, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith, Snider, Stephenson, Sturton, Sylva, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Wallace, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White (Halton), White, [East Hastings], Whitehead, Wilson, Young.—137.

Mr. FERGUSON entered the House and took his seat amid cheers, which appeared general, the House thus expressing the wide spread sympathy felt for him out of doors.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—I flatter myself that I have a good working majority [laughter].

Mr. BLAKE said he could not find words strong enough to express his sense of the treatment which Parliament had experienced from the Government in this matter. Had their action been taken under assumed or real pressure of some great public crisis, there could be hardly an excuse for such a course. Parliament should, at least, be summoned to deliberate on such a grave measure. What language then could be found to express the censure which Government deserved for having, while Parliament was in session, taken upon themselves the responsibility of sending this draft Act to the Imperial Government without ever having asked the assent of the House to it. He congratulated the Government on their speedy conversion with respect to this principle which they had opposed before recess and voted for after recess. He congratulated their inde-

pendent followers on the manner in which they had followed the Government. He had seen the hon. gentlemen eat dirt before, but he had never seen them swallow it whole before. But he was opposed to the Manitoba Act on its merits. It proposed to alter the fundamental principle of the constitution—representation by population—and to confer upon this Government the power to adjust the representation of Manitoba and any future Provinces of the North West, as they pleased. The Government had written themselves down as opposed to their own Acts. Having amended the motion now, he would vote against it.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the course of the Government this evening showed to what desperate shifts they were reduced to defend their blunders. Their action on this question betrayed a pitiable condition of imbecility. They might have saved themselves this humiliation if the Hon. Minister of Militia had come down and admitted honestly that he was in the wrong.

A vote was then taken on the amended motion which was carried.

Yeas, 99; Nays, 38.

YEAS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brosseau, Burton, Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Chauveau, Cheval, Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Delorme, Dobbie, Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Forbes, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Gray, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Hurdon, Jackson, Joly, Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Keeler, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McCallum, McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Paquet, Pearson, Pelletier, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pozer, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Ryan, [King's, N.B.], Ryan [Montreal West], Savary, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [East Hastings], Wilson, Wright [Ottawa County].—99.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Burr, Cameron [Huron], Carmichael, Cartwright, Ferris, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Jones [Halifax], Kempt, McFarlane, McKenzie, McConkey, McDougall [Laurel], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Mills, Morison [Victoria, O.], Oliver, Redford, Ross [Dundas], Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Wellington, C.R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Sevier, Smith, Snider, Storton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Young.—38.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BLAKE moved the second reading of the Act securing the independence of the Senate. He said that he considered the present position of the Senate very undesirable. That body was called upon to perform a most important part in the government of the country, and there was no

reason that it should not be as carefully guarded against Government influence as the "Commons." The terms on which the members of the Senate held their exalted position rather led to the conclusion that peculiar care should be taken that Government temptations should in no measure affect their usefulness. He would be the last to interfere with the constitution in the smallest matter, and to avoid that difficulty he did not propose that any one should be ineligible to be appointed to the Senate, but a Senator should not be eligible for any office of emolument. No one who cared for the usefulness of the Senate would desire that it should become the mere refuge of the worn out members of the House of Commons, and the Senators themselves would be the last to permit such a thing, although there were cases in which persons who had changed their views had received their reward in a seat in that Chamber with offices of profit. It was obviously wrong to say that members of the House of Commons could not do their duty to the people and be in receipt of pay, but that, when placed in the Senate, they still could receive pay and do their duty to the people. He implored the House, therefore, to consider the matter and aid him in the effort he was making to secure the independence of the Upper House. He knew that in answer to his arguments, he would be referred to the House of Lords, but he held that the House of Lords was by no means a parallel case, and he was quite sure that it was utterly impossible that the Senate could retain that hold on the public confidence that it ought to possess, unless its independence was guarded in the most jealous way possible.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member in the latter portion of his remarks had shown that he had no confidence in the principle of the measure he was advocating—he had said that he knew what arguments would be urged against him. Senators were appointed by the Crown for life, and no one could expect them to relinquish any of the privileges that the Crown might bestow on them. If any measure were originated in the House of Commons in England, providing that no Government employment should be granted to a member of the House of Lords, it would be considered an attempt against the usefulness and independence of that body. If that argument was good in England it was good here. The body might be called the House of Lords, the Senate, or the Legislative Council, but the principle was the same, and the same rule ought to be followed. It was all very well for the House to pass a

Mr. Blake.

measure securing its own independence, and providing that its members should not be exposed to any corruption or undue influence, but it should not extend the measure to the other branch. This rule had been maintained in the old Province of Canada. So long as the Legislative Council was appointed by the Crown, there was no interference with it on the part of the other House, but so soon as it was subjected to the electoral system, the laws affecting the one House were applied to the other. The measure proposed that a Senator should relinquish all privileges the Crown might bestow on him, and it was surely too much to ask the concurrence of the other House to such a measure—was it right, was it prudent that any degree of antagonism should be introduced between the two Houses. Surely it was not proper that a measure affecting the privileges of the one House should originate in the other. If such a measure was passed in the Senate and referred to the Commons that might give it their consideration, but constitutional etiquette required that they should not originate the measure. It was not necessary to discuss the principles of the measure, for he was sure the House would feel that if it were to be considered at all, it should originate with the Senate.

Mr. BODWELL supported the proposed Bill. He objected to the vicious principle which would place worn out politicians in such responsible position as the Upper House. Inasmuch as the Senators were not responsible to the people, they should be placed beyond the possibility of having their independence undermined. They were only human and could not be supposed to be less exposed to danger from temptation than other men.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. member opposite seemed to think that in all matters affecting the Senate, this House should take for its model the House of Lords of England. But the cases were not analagous. During the Confederation debate he had expressed an opinion in favour of a nominated Senate, but he confessed that the manifestations of human faults both on the part of the Government and individual members of the Senate, had caused him to alter his opinion. He had listened carefully to the arguments of the Hon. Minister of Militia, and had heard no good valid reason for rejecting this Bill, excepting the one that it should have originated in the Senate. If he (Mr. Mackenzie) regarded this Bill as displaying any discourtesy to the Senate, he would not give it his support, but he did not believe that it would be so regarded by the Upper House. The two bodies were con-

stituted with co-ordinate powers, and the Senate had a right to originate a measure affecting this House at anytime they might think fit to do so.

Mr. MILLS had always been opposed to nominating the Senate. He did not believe that the Upper House should be made a sort of political Magdalene Asylum, for the prostituted politicians seduced by the Administration of the day in this House.

Mr. BLAKE summed up the debate.

A division was then taken on the motion for a second reading, which was lost.

YEAS.—Anglin, Ault, Barthe, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bourassa, Bowell, Bowman, Burpee, Carmichael, Cheval, Coupal, Currier, Delorme, Dorion, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Geoffrion, Gibbs, Godin, Holton, Joly, Jones, Kempt, Killam, Lapum, Little, Macfarlane, Mackenzie, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Renfrew), Merritt, Mills, Morrison (Victoria), Munroe, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria), Ross (Wellington), Rymal, Scatcherd, Snider, Stirton, Thompson, Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Whitehead, Young.—57

NAYS.—Archambeault, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Cameron, (Inverness) Caron, Cartier, Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Crawford, (Brockville), Dufresne, Dunkin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gray, Hincks, Holmes, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lawson, Macdonald (Antigonish), Macdonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Perrebonne), Macdougall (Three Rivers) McKeagney, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison, Pearson, Perry, Pinsonneault, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain) Ryan (Montreal West), Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Willson.—58.

THE MANITOBA ELECTIONS.

The SPEAKER announced the return of the Writs from Manitoba, declaring Donald R. A. Smith, Pierre Delorme and Dr. Schultz, duly elected, and a tie in the other electoral district of the Province.

Mr. MACKENZIE said these Writs could not be recorded on the journals since an address had been forwarded to the Queen, praying that the Imperial Parliament be asked to legalize the Act, on which these elections had taken place, and it was quite impossible for this House to recognize these Writs.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Manitoba Act was quite constitutional, and the draft of the Bill forwarded to the Im-

perial Parliament was simply for the purpose of removing a legal doubt, nothing more.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said there must be an enquiry on this subject in the present state of the law before these gentlemen were allowed to take their seat.

Hon. Col. GRAY said the Manitoba Act having received the Queen's assent, the members elected to this House in Manitoba were elected under the law and their return was therefore quite valid.

GALLERIES CLEARED.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL called attention to the fact that there were strangers in the gallery, and demanded that they be turned out.

At this point the Sergeant-at-Arms appeared in the Reporter's Gallery and turned out the representatives of the Press. The step was taken in accordance with the notifications of Mr. Macdougall, given some time ago, that he would order that the galleries be cleared of strangers on the first occasion that he saw Senator Miller in the House.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half past seven o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade against the Bill exempting the North Shore Railway Company from building drawbridges across navigable rivers.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD presented a petition from Ottawa Board of Trade respecting a railway from Toronto, &c.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL presented certain returns asked for by Hon. Mr. Bureau in connection with the Lachine Regatta.

LIFE INSURANCE.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN submitted report from Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills on the Bill incorporating the Mutual Life Insurance Association of Canada, and on the Bill respecting the New Brunswick Synod—the former with amendments, the latter without any amendments.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN said that the amendments met with the approval of the promoters of the Association, and that they were framed in the interests of the public.

Hon. Sir G. B. Cartier.

He moved that the House concur in the amendments.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON seconded the motion.

The report was adopted.

Third reading ordered for to-morrow.

NEW BRUNSWICK SYNOD.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT moved that the Bill respecting the New Brunswick Synod be read a third time.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked why it was that the Bill did not contain the provisions which had been embodied in a similar Act passed last session—one referring to the persons and parishes in the diocese which did not choose to belong to the Synod; the other referring to the ecclesiastical power given to the Synod over the members of the Church.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT replied that all the parishes of New Brunswick, represented in Synod by their clergy, and lay delegates, had concurred unanimously in the provisions asked for.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY wished to know if there were not some parishes which were not represented.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD explained that there were some parishes which had not given their assent to the measure, but he took it for granted that as every opportunity had been given them to make representations against the Bill, and they had not done so, they were perfectly satisfied, especially as there were provisions reserving to the parishes a voice in the appointment of their rectors—which was not the case in Ontario—and also preventing the Synod from interfering with the church corporation with respect to the lands which are in their possession under an Act of the Province.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

BRIDGES.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL introduced a Bill of a general nature in reference to draw bridges over navigable rivers. The measure, he explained, requires that a notice shall be given in the *Official Gazette*, and otherwise, of an application from any Company to establish fixed bridges, and also proposes to give the power of arranging the matter to the Governor in Council. In exercising that power, however, nothing shall be done to interfere with the navigation of rivers.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SANBORN, the

time for receiving petitions on Private Bills was extended to the 2nd April next.

MESSAGE.

A Message was received from the House of Commons stating that that House had passed the following Bills:—

To extend the provisions of the Act respecting harbour dues by the harbour of the Town of Owen's Sound. Second reading to-morrow.

To indemnify members of the Executive Government, and others, for the unavoidable expenditure of public money in excess of the amount granted by Parliament for the payment of expenses incurred in repelling the Fenian invasion. Second reading to-morrow.

To assimilate the currency of the Dominion. Second reading on Friday.

To authorize the Corporation of Trenton Village, to collect harbour dues. Second reading on Thursday.

IRON COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON moved that the petition of the Forsyth Iron Company be referred back to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills for reconsideration. The promoters of the Bill, he explained, were not aware that their petition was under consideration of the Committee, and were not represented before it. They believed that if they had an opportunity of presenting themselves before the Committee they would shew that their Bill was of a general character, entitling them to an Act of Incorporation from this Parliament.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that in ordinary cases a day's notice of such a motion should be given, and went on to question the propriety of such companies coming before the Federal Parliament for Acts of incorporation. So far as the Committee were concerned they had no doubt whatever, that the Bill in question properly came under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. He thought that it was very necessary that the question of divided jurisdiction should be definitely settled. The Local Legislatures seemed to entertain the view that when they incorporated an Insurance or other Company, it should be limited to the Province itself, under that section of the British North America Act which gives them the power to incorporate for Provincial objects. He was of opinion that in making such restrictions, the Local Legislatures failed to have a full understanding of the powers of a corporation.

The motion was carried.

CURRENCY.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN asked the Government what expense has been incurred at St. John up to the 1st January, 1871, in receiving at the Treasury, uncurrent Nova Scotia notes? What amount has been so received up to that date? Has such expense been borne by the Dominion or the Province of Nova Scotia, and whether the arrangement will be continued during the present year?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that no expense had been incurred up to the date in question.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN put the following enquiries to the Government:—

1st. What returns are in possession of this Government showing that the population of British Columbia should be "taken at" 60,000 under Section 2 of the Terms agreed upon?

2nd. What is the estimated amount required for the Mail Service between Victoria and San Francisco and Olympia, under Section 4?

3rd. What is the Scale proposed for the Salaries and other charges, from A to I, under the 5th Section?

4th. What is the probable amount of Pensions to be granted under Section 6?

5th. What is the estimated cost of the Railway (from the Pacific to the nearest railway in Canada) as stipulated for in the 11th Section?

6th. Is the Graving Dock at Esquimalt after the expenditure of £100,000 sterling to be the property of the Dominion or of British Columbia?

7th. To what extent is the Legislative Council of British Columbia an elective body, and what evidence is there that the Terms proposed have proved generally acceptable to the people of the Colony.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL gave the following reply: First. There were no returns in the possession of the Government, but information derived from the British Columbia delegates led them to believe that there is a population in that Colony of over 60,000—some 16,000 whites, 1,000 Chinese, and 40 or 45,000 Indians. It was also urged that the population were larger consumers of dutiable goods, than the population of Canada were and would therefore return more proportionately to the revenue.

Second. A similar semi-weekly service of 760 miles in the Upper Lakes was performed for \$12,000. A service for nearly thrice the distance in the Gulf, once a week, cost \$15,000. Therefore, the House

could, in that way, obtain an idea of the probable expense.

Third. The aggregate of those charges would be about \$109,000.

Fourth. The pensions were not yet settled, but there were some four persons whose offices would be affected, and the amount to which they would be entitled, would range from \$2,000 to \$4,000.

Fifth.—He was not in a position to state what the cost of the railway would be, but could say that it was not the policy of the Government of the Dominion, to be themselves the constructors of the work, and that its expense to Canada would not in any way be beyond the advantages to be attained, and would be infinitely within the resources of the country. We knew what had been done on the other side of the border, the Northern Pacific Railway was being built simply by land grants. We had certainly plenty of land to give for the same purpose, and the Government proposed to act very liberally. The Dominion might be obliged to give a subsidy in money, but the Government would carefully consider the public interests in that particular.

Sixth. The dock would be the property of British Columbia, if that Province built it. The Dominion proposed to participate in the construction of the work to the extent stated in the terms.

Seventh. The Legislative Council was composed of 15 persons—nine elected. During the recent election of that number, the issue turned directly on the question of Union with Canada, and the people decided emphatically in the affirmative.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE.

In pursuance of the order of the day,

The Bill to prevent corrupt practices in connection with the collection of the revenue was read a third time and finally passed as amended.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1871.

After Routine,

Mr. SIMPSON introduced a Bill to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Railway and Bridge Company.

MANITOBA ELECTION RETURNS.

Mr. MACKENZIE referred to the return of the writs from Manitoba, and asked if it was the intention of the Government to

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

refer the matter to a special Committee to report on them to the House. Under the peculiar circumstances attending the election, some such precaution should be taken.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government did not intend to take any such action until the newly elected candidates should arrive from Manitoba or until objections should be urged to their taking their seats in the House.

QUEBEC HARBOUR.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN introduced a Bill to provide for the improvement and management of the Harbor of Quebec.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the House go into Committee to consider a series of resolutions respecting the admission of British Columbia into Union with Canada. This subject, he said, was one which required few words to introduce it. Its importance was recognized by all. Who would have thought twelve years ago when British Columbia was erected into a colony by Lord Lytton, that it should form in so short a time a portion of Canada. It was due to the foresight and statesmanship of that great literary man that he should quote from a speech of his, delivered in 1858, in which this great union was foretold. He was now quoting from the prorogation speech delivered on the 2nd August, 1858. It said: "The Act to which Her Majesty's assent for the establishing of the Colony of British Columbia was originally required in consequence of the recent discoveries of gold in that district, but Her Majesty hopes that this new Colony on the Pacific may be but one of several in a greater state of progress, by which Her Majesty's dominions in British North America may be ultimately peopled in an unbroken chain from the Atlantic to the Pacific by loyal subjects of Her Majesty's Crown." Could the present movement have been more clearly foretold. Since 1858 the scheme of Confederation had made great strides towards completion. He (Sir George) regretted the absence of the hon. member for Shefford on this occasion. That gentleman had often complained that this country was advancing too slowly, and said that the Dominion would advance more rapidly if placed on an independent footing. But, if the hon. member for Shefford was present to-day, he could not charge the Ministry with having been idle since they had brought about the union of all British North America since they had assumed office. While in London with his

(Sir George's) colleagues, at a dinner where several literary men were present, he mentioned to Lord Lytton, who was not then in office, that the Confederation scheme was one of the principal objects which had brought him to England. Lord Lytton replied, "I presume that you have come not merely to see that the British North American Atlantic Provinces should be united. I hope you look forward to the greater Confederation which will reach to the Pacific Ocean." He (Sir George) would now come to the Bill itself. It was before the House, and they could examine it for themselves. He invited the freest and fullest discussion on each and every clause, but he would remind them that the Bill was in the nature of a treaty, and consequently the Government would insist upon the adoption of those terms as adopted in British Columbia—that the amendment of one paragraph or one item of those terms would defeat the whole project. He took this early opportunity of informing the House of the fact. British Columbia had decided to accept the Bill without amendments, though several members of the Legislature of that colony had shown a disposition to amend the measure in some of its parts. The necessity of accepting this Bill as it stood must be apparent to all. The population of British Columbia was set down at 60,000, and it was certainly not below that number, if the Indians and Chinese were included as well as the whites. The customs duty collected under the tariff of the colony amounted to \$350,000, which would give about twice as much per head for the population, as was collected in the Dominion. Each inhabitant of Canada was supposed to contribute \$3 to the Revenue per year, while each inhabitant of the colony contributed nearly twice that amount. It might be said that the Tariff was higher than ours, but it was not so much so as to make this difference if the population were not there. The House would therefore, admit that the Government did not err in estimating the population at 60,000. The delegates of British Columbia wished to have the subsidy placed at 80c. per head for a population of 120,000, but on being informed that it would be impossible to obtain the assent of Parliament to such terms they allowed the population to be put at 60,000. This was an opportune time to admit the Colony into the Union, for it was desirable to extend the Confederation to the Pacific as soon as possible, and on economical grounds it was advisable to admit the colony into the Dominion before the increase of population could increase the subsidy to a very large rate. Then with respect to the clause providing for provisions it

must be remembered that British Columbia was a Crown colony. Under it several officers were appointed for life, and they should be provided for. The colony had latterly adopted responsible Government which was to commence from the date of the union, so that no future charges of this kind need be expended in the future. There were very few such pensions to be provided for; the majority of them would be employed under the Federal Government. Then, with respect to the tariff, it was provided that they should retain their own tariff, which was higher than ours, till the completion of the Pacific Railway. No inconvenience need be anticipated from it, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case it was necessary to allow them to retain it. Item eleven, relating to the construction of the Pacific Railway, would no doubt provoke discussion. There were various unfounded rumours with respect to this. It was not the intention of the Government to construct the road, but it would be undertaken by companies to be assisted mainly by land grants (hear, hear). It was not the intention of the Government to burden the exchequer much to obtain this railway (hear, hear). While this clause was under discussion between the delegates and the Government it was proposed by the Dominion that the colony should hand over a forty mile strip of land towards the construction of the railway. That would be 24,000 square miles of land, or 50,360,000 acres of land, (not merely agricultural land, but mineral land. Placing that land at \$1 per acre it would be equal to a grant of \$50,360,000 towards the construction of the railway. It was proposed to give the colony \$100,000 per annum, which, placing the interest at 5 per cent., would be the annual interest on the value of 2,000,000 acres of land, leaving the remainder to be used by this Government. The railway, starting from Nippissing would be about 2,500 miles, 700 miles of which would pass through Ontario. They did not expect to get entirely the 20 mile grant on each side of the road, but they expected to get from the Ontario Government every alternate lot on each side of the line for that 200 miles. That would give 9,000,000 acres of land from the Ontario Government. Starting from Lake Nippissing it would connect with the Ontario system of railways and with the Quebec system of railways through the Ottawa Valley. They were prepared to give it to any company which would undertake the construction of the line, with a capital of twenty-five millions of dollars, which with interest at five per cent, would represent \$1,500,000 per annum. The hon. member for Sherbrooke

had recently remarked that the certain increase of receipts from customs and excise was at the rate of five per cent per year. At that rate, taking the customs at \$10,000,000, the increase would be \$500,000, and on excise, taking the receipts at \$5,000,000, \$250,000. That would give a total from these two sources alone to meet \$1,500,000 per annum, a sum of \$750,000. He knew it would be argued that this railway would cost between one and two hundred millions of dollars, if not more.

Mr. RYMAL—How much do you estimate the cost at?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER would compare it with the American Pacific Railway, which from Omaha to the Pacific was 1775 miles in length. That railway was aided by land and money grants, and cost \$50,000,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway would be about 700 miles longer. Yet he would place the cost at double the rate of the American Pacific Railway, and the utmost cost that could be incurred would be \$100,000,000. But, whatever it would cost, he would assure the House that there would be no taxation on the country more than existed at present (cheers). A certain portion of the public lands had been reserved for the Indians, and the only guarantee that was necessary for the future good treatment of the Aborigines was the manner in which they had been treated in the past. Now, having glanced at the provisions of the Bill would call the attention of the House to the fact that while our neighbours had taken sixty years to extend their borders to the Pacific, the young Dominion would have accomplished it inside of ten years (cheers.) And look at the importance of the extension. We needed a sea board on the Pacific if ever this Dominion was to be a powerful nation in the future, and what more convenient time could there be for this union than at the present time? He concluded by an allusion to the splendid position which England had attained by the development of her marine power, and that even Prussia, notwithstanding the triumphs she had lately won, must be content to take a second place beside the great maritime power of England. The honourable Baronet resumed his seat amid loud cheers.

In reply to questions from Hon. Sir A. T. GALT and Hon. Mr. HOLTON, as to the financial results of the present agreement, and remarks upon the importance of information on this subject, and explanations as to how increased taxation would be avoided in execution of this scheme.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS had not expected at this early period to go into the financial

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

aspect of the question. As to the railway the idea had been that it could be constructed by a liberal land grant and liberal money subsidy. It was not expected bring this subject forward this session. But various plans would be considered proposed to capitalists, including land grants. The money charge was estimated at one million to a million and a quarter dollars per annum, which would not involve additional Dominion taxation. Capitalists were likely to survey the road at their own expense. Government thought it necessary that they should assume responsibility for survey and location line, this expenditure to be afterwards made the first charge on the road. Charges to the Dominion in connection with British Columbia were estimated at \$460,000, and the revenue from all sources about \$360,000, leaving an annual charge of about \$100,000 upon Canada.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS, in reply to JONES, of Leeds, said the road would cost about one hundred millions of dollars.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said the admission of British Columbia into the Union was desirable to all parties, the only question being as to the terms upon which it was to be based. He was willing within certain restrictions to accept any terms with that object. The first involved the avoidance of the violation of any constitutional rights of the people of that colony, and the second the abstaining from the imposition of onerous burdens on the people of Canada. In view of the many important public or national works claiming attention, it behoved us to guard carefully against unduly augmenting the demand upon our resources. Not only had railways and canals and other works to be provided for, but the defence of the country, according to past contracts and legislation. Now there was no doubt that the union of this colony and the Dominion would be productive of little benefit would probably, but prove a source of fruitless expense unless it could be also united by means of a good railway communication. That was why a railway had been made one of the terms of the compact. But its conditions necessarily required consideration. We should have to take care not to cripple the powers and means of the Local Government by those conditions, in regard to future enterprises. While it was desirable a road to our Western territory and through the colony should be made for the settlement of that vast region, the Local Government should not be deprived of the means of securing works of local value and promise. The object of the House then should be the creation of this

needed communication in conditions not antagonistic to British Columbia local improvements, without provisions for which we could not expect it to enter the Union. The resources of that country naturally presented themselves to our notice in this connection. What were they? A reliable authority in British Columbia lately stated the population at 10,000 whites and 10,000 Indians. Now these aborigines could not be placed on an equal footing with the whites for the purpose of framing the financial basis of the Union. They could not be regarded as the equals of the whites for revenue purposes at least. The imports and exports also deserved our notice. The exports were principally furs, lumber and some gold and coal. The imports included articles dutiable in Canada, besides breadstuffs and such like commodities, from which the bulk of the revenue was derived. In 1867 the total amount was estimated at \$37,000, of which the customs yielded \$350,000. The Dominion would receive, as the remainder arising from excise and amounting to over \$150,000 falling to the Colony. The present terms of the Union were considerably less advantageous to Canada than the former both as regards the railway and other matters. Before it was left optional with us when we should commence the work which, however, was to be completed within a reasonable period, but the subsequent conditions required the commencement of the road within two years and its completion within five years. We might have finished the work within ten years, but were not compelled to do it. The cost of the road would be very great, one hundred millions being the government estimate, and a considerable proportion of this amount must come from the Dominion cheque. The present engagement at the time was much beyond what British Columbia asked at first, and in the second place the road was rendered more burdensome from the extension to Nipissing, rather than at first spoken of. The present terms were enormously more burdensome to Canada than the former. The estimated revenue from Columbia was \$386,000, and payments by Dominion \$536,000 apart from indirect engagements. At this revenue from British Columbia depended upon maintenance of its tariff. The result was that the colony would receive \$150,000 to \$170,000 a year from Canada for Union, including a trade guarantee for the works at Esquimaux. He could not object to that price for political Union, and did not think it too great an equivalent for valuable lands exacted from a colony for the railway. But there were other conditions of a serious and ob-

jectionable nature in view of our circumstances and prospects. He objected to the hands of the country being tied as to the period within which the Dominion should commence and complete the railway. As it was, after the British Columbia delegates came to Ottawa, Canada's obligations became enormously enhanced. If the colonists did not command this condition as compensation for the reduction of the estimate of population from 120,000 to 60,000, or to provide means needed for local purposes, why should our Government have voluntarily assumed this serious obligation not at first proposed. He deprecated interference with one of the principles of our constitution, namely, representation by population, by these resolutions. He indicated the evils of admitting colonies or territories on the footing of present members of Confederation. The American territorial system presented an attractive contrast with ours in this respect. If not admitted till they reached a certain stage of growth and development, they would have certain local works completed not necessary to be assumed by the Dominion. At present, to admit such Provinces as British Columbia we had to depart from this principle of representation by population to give the people proper representation, and frame the financial basis of our Union to enable the new comers to carry on the government, and other enterprises. One important object for us was to avoid incurring obligations oppressive to our people, who numbered but four millions. By these resolutions they were threatened with a very grave responsibility in regard to the early commencement and completion of the Pacific Railway. He was certainly opposed to terms of this kind, however desirous of extending the Union and meeting the wishes of British Columbia (cheers).

Hon. Mr. TILLEY referred to the remarks of the honourable member for Sherbrooke as to the difference between the requests made by British Columbia, and what was proposed to be granted by the Government. He said the only difference was as regards the communication, it being decided that there should be a guarantee for the specified time of ten years, which would allow ample time for the construction of the Railway, and the Government had thought it better to limit the matter to ten years instead of making a guarantee in perpetuity. The member for Sherbrooke had stated that all British Columbia asked for was a coach road connecting Fort Garry with the Government roads of British Columbia, and an expenditure of a million dollars a year on a railway, and that the proposition submitted by the

Government was less favourable to Canada. He entirely dissented from the honourable member on that matter, on these grounds. When the road had been proposed it had been found from enquiry and investigation, that from the high cost of labor, and other charges that would have to be met in constructing such a road within the stated time of three years, that the cost would be very heavy, very heavy indeed, and in addition to this it was coupled with a proposition that a Railway should be built as soon as practicable, and that there should be an annual expenditure from the commencement of a million of dollars. Under these circumstances the Government had held that any expenditure on a coach road was useless, and one that was not required, inasmuch as all the traffic would be taken by the railway as soon as completed. Taking this view therefore the Government had at once dissented from the proposition of British Columbia, and would not agree to it. The Government had also considered it unwise to consent to an annual expenditure of a million of dollars from the commencement without having any particulars as to the difficulties that would be met with, and had rather preferred that the whole work should be undertaken in a reasonable specified time,—as they thought a proper survey should be made, and the work then completed as speedily as possible. Then again the propositions of British Columbia had been changed in respect of representation in the Dominion House of Parliament. Reverting to the matter of the railway, he said the House had heard that it was estimated that the money grant necessary to construct the railway, in addition to the land grant, would amount to $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions per annum, but it must not be understood that the expenditure of that sum of money was involved in the proposition before the House. That proposition was simply to admit British Columbia into the Dominion and connect her with the Dominion system of railways, and it must be remembered that the agreement entered into by the delegates at the conferences at Quebec and London, was that the six Provinces should be brought together, and also that the Red River country and British Columbia should also be included in the Confederation. Such was the agreement, and happily, part had been accomplished, for notwithstanding all the trouble, all the anxiety, and all the difficulties that had arisen in connection with the North West, he believed the conviction from one end of the country to the other was that that country had been acquired on very favorable terms. Well the next thing after getting possession, was how to utilize it, and

how could it be utilized? Surely not by building coach roads, not by simply improving the communication by water, no—the North West could only be used to advantage by means of a railway running to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and the Government would not be doing its duty to the Dominion unless it projected that work. It was well known on the most reliable information, that in the valley of the Saskatchewan and the Red River there was a tract of Prairie Land, immense in extent, and magnificent in character, and how could immigration be conducted to that country, how could supplies be carried to settlers, how could the produce of that country be brought to a market unless there was a railway, and he did not hesitate to say that it had been the deliberately expressed opinion of the House and the country, that as soon as the country was acquired, a railway must be built to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Believing this to be the determination of the Government and the country, the delegates from British Columbia came and submitted a proposition that that Railway should be extended from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, and he put it to the House and the Pacific, whether a line could not be built to the Pacific, much cheaper, in proportion, than one ending at the Rocky mountains. The one would be available for local traffic only, and very much larger subsidies, therefore, would have to be paid, whereas a line running from the Atlantic to the Pacific would receive a very large amount of through traffic, and in addition to this, it had always been contemplated and determined that there should be such a line through Canadian Territory. It had been stated both by the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance that it was not considered that the amount necessary for the construction of the railway, would involve any increase in the taxation of the people of the Dominion, and he had no doubt that that statement was correct, for taking the calculations of the hon. member for Sherbrooke himself as a basis, that the annual increase of the population of the Dominion would be three per cent., (although when the railway to the Pacific was completed, and the vast Territory of the North West opened for settlement, there was no doubt the increase would be much greater), he believed the additional revenue derived from that increased population, irrespective of the increased paying ability, estimated at two per cent. by the member for Sherbrooke, would be fully equal to all demands upon it without any increased taxation. He entirely agreed with his hon. friend that it was impossible to take large Provinces into the

Hon. Mr. Tilley.

Dominion with a small population, and acquire all their lands without giving them in return the means of carrying out the local works necessary to make the country attractive to immigrants, and how could it be expected that the people of this large Province, twice the size of Ontario, would be in a position to develop the resources of their country without assistance—and that assistance was what the Government proposed to render in the proposition before the House? The member for Sherbrooke had said that he would have preferred that the Government should have come down and have asked a direct vote for that purpose, but he would remind the hon. member that he had not been in favor of that mode, when it was proposed with reference to Newfoundland. The delegates from British Columbia estimated the population of their country, at 13,000 whites, 5,000 Chinese, and 45,000 Indians. Then what was there to be got out of this country. At the present time it cost from 12c to 14c a pound for all supplies sent into that country, and no one could live there unless he earned \$5 a day. If, however, the country were opened up, they would be able to get supplies there as cheap as at Ottawa, and those who now live on \$5 a day would be able to live on \$250 a day, and there would very soon be a population which would yield a revenue that would speedily compensate for the cost of the railway. According to his judgement, seeing they had the North West, and must develop it, there was no question but that the Railway must be built, and even in a financial point of view, although he did not assume to have anything like the knowledge or experience of financial matters as was possessed by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, he could not see that there would be any difficulty. The line of railway would pass through magnificent lands, and the proposed grant would give fifty million acres, leaving every alternate lot which could be converted into a sinking fund or some other mode for securing the amount of money granted, and taking into consideration the probable increase of population, the speedy settlement of the North West on its being opened up, and the increased paying ability, he had no fear, and the Government had no fear, that the people would be subjected to any increase of taxation.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY resumed the debate. He had been pointing out the difference between the proposition of British Columbia, and that adopted ultimately, which he

regarded as the more favourable to the Dominion. In connection with the railway scheme he would take issue with his hon. friend from Sherbrooke. By the construction of the road the population of the Pacific coast would soon be so increased as to pay for the cost of the road in a very short time. A gentleman who had worked in the mines of California, lecturing on this subject a few years ago, argued that such a result would soon be attained by building the railway. The hon. member for Sherbrooke was willing to give a subsidy to British Columbia without admitting it as a Province for some time to come. In making this admission, the hon. member gave up the whole case, for, if he could not object to giving a subsidy under such circumstances and without deriving every advantage from the expenditure, he surely ought not to object when British Columbia was ready to surrender her revenues to the Dominion. The increase of the debt would not fall on the present population of the Dominion alone. The evidence which the increase of the Western States since the construction of railways through them, was that the North West would soon be filled up with a population brought there by the new railway which would soon pay for its construction. With reference to the question of fortifications, he would say that he hoped the result of the present negotiations at Washington would be such as to prevent all necessity for the construction of such works. The expense for local works would hardly amount to as much as the hon. member for Sherbrooke estimated they would. Excluding the annual sum of \$100,000 for the land grant and the expenses of Government, these charges would amount to a total of \$361,300. The revenue amounted to \$363,400, which, of course, would largely increase in the future. The difference, therefore, was not so great after all. Even supposing that the local Government should accept our lower tariff, the revenue would reach \$308,000. The \$100,000 was, therefore, the amount of expenditure in excess of receipts, and for this the Dominion received a large grant of valuable land. Now, the question was, was the union of the colony worth the cost? The Pacific railway, already in course of construction through the North Western States of the United States, was being built without the expenditure of a single dollar. It was being built by the land grants which had been made to the company. But, the hon. member for Lambton said there were only 50,000,000 acres of good land to be settled in the North West. Admitting it to be the fact, what difference did it make so long as it was settled. That

was the main point. Persons who had travelled through the Fertile Belt had informed him that there was no engineering difficulties to be met with this side of the Rocky Mountains, and there could be no difficulty in getting a company to undertake the construction of the railway. Having said this much, the case was clear. The question was now, whether it was better to embrace the opportunity to complete the Confederation scheme, or to let this best chance of all pass by unimproved for consummating the union. He could understand why Annexationists should be opposed to this extension of the Union, but he could not understand how the Independence advocates like the hon. member for Sherbrooke could oppose it. He could tell hon. members who did not approve of this scheme that delay was dangerous, and if this chance to bring British Columbia was not improved that Colony might yet be absorbed into the American Union.

Mr. BLAKE—How?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said as the country was at present the miners were obliged to pay enormous prices for the necessaries of life and they were looking to this country for the means of communication by which they were to be supplied at reasonable rates. If Canada would not undertake it, they might look to the Republic for help (hear, hear). But this Union could benefit Canada commercially, for the opening up of the North West and the consequent increase of trade must bring an immense volume of trade to Montreal and Quebec and the Maritime cities. Everything conspired to make this Union a prosperous one and he did not doubt that the House would sustain the measure which was now submitted to them (cheers).

Mr. MACKENZIE regretted that the hon. gentleman opposite could not discuss this question for three quarters of an hour without threatening the annexation of that colony to the United States if this House rejected the present propositions. Such a line of argument could only be indulged in by the hon. gentlemen in order to create a feeling that the papers brought down as agreed between the Dominion Government, and that of Columbia is in the nature of a treaty that is not to be altered by any proposition to be made in this House, if such were the case it would be useless to discuss the question. In 1865 the Parliaments of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, were told the same story with reference to the resolutions which formed the basis of Confederation, but those resolutions were afterwards altered by the delegation at London, and he was not pre-

Hon. Mr. Tilley.

pared to accept these resolutions in the nature of a treaty which this House could not alter. He believed on the other hand that it was essential for the future prosperity of the Dominion, that this colony should be admitted into the Union and that there should be the best possible understanding as to the terms of admission to prevent future complications, and he should not be prepared to acquiesce quietly in the resolutions which had been prepared by the hon. gentlemen opposite. By these resolutions, the basis of our political system would be violated as was done in the case of Manitoba last session, and after the struggle which had to be gone through to secure that basis, he should certainly oppose any further attempt to alter it, that is representation by population as regards the House of Commons. Some deviation he acknowledged might be made in the Senate. The Hon. Minister of Customs tells us that the population of Whites, Chinese, and Indians is 60,000 in that country, but we have never given representation under our system to Indians. If such were allowed we could claim several more members for Ontario. He would consent to a considerable grant of money to carry on the Government of a new colony, and particularly of such a difficult country as Columbia, and he would not show himself less liberal than any other member of this House in considering what ought to be done in the present case. In the discussion in reference to Newfoundland, he preferred allowing a sum to carry on the Government rather than make over the public lands, as while the revenue was \$3,000 per annum, the cost of management was \$6,000, and he took the same view with regard to the land grant for the construction of the railway to the Pacific. From all he knew of the country after descending from the Rocky Mountains the country was valueless for agricultural purposes. The gold mines have certainly proved very remunerative, but they are carried on by large companies, and the large importations of breadstuffs into the colony corroborated the barrenness of the land. He thought the Government should be prepared to give every information as to the mode they propose of constructing the Railway, and whether any propositions had been received for its construction. He denounced the Government for desiring to undertake the completion of the work in ten years, and should certainly record his protest against such an arrangement, and he considered that to give such an immense grant as was proposed to any Company would be to retard the settlement of the country, as was found to be the case in the western States.

He doubted very much if the Province of Ontario would grant the land as anticipated by the Minister of Customs, and if they did the greater part of it was valueless for cultivation, and certainly would not realize \$1 per acre as estimated. The Northern Pacific road was largely built by English capital before the land and money grant of the United States was obtained, and the difficulties were not to be compared to those which would be met on the Canadian Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway would cost from 6 to seven times as much as the Intercolonial, and he was not prepared to involve the country so deeply. He then moved in amendment that all the words after "that" be expunged, and the following substituted:—

The proposed terms of union with British Columbia pledge the Dominion to commence within two years and complete within ten years the Pacific Railway, the route for which has not been surveyed, nor has the expense been calculated—the said terms also pledge the Government of Canada to a yearly payment to British Columbia of the sum of \$100,000 in perpetuity, equal to a capital sum of \$2,000,000 for the cession of a tract of waste land of the route of the Pacific Railway to aid in its construction, which British Columbia ought to cede without charge, in like manner as the lands of Canada are proposed to be ceded for the same purpose. This House is of opinion that Canada should not be pledged to do more than proceed at once with the necessary survey, and, after the route is determined, to prosecute the work at as early a period as the state of its finances will justify, and that the further consideration of the said terms be postponed with a view to obtaining some modification thereof.

Dr. GRANT said, I have listened with a very great degree of pleasure to the broad spirited and statesmanlike observations of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. Truly, this is the age of union, in which we, as a people enjoying the fullest extent of freedom under the eye and protection of the Mother Country, should come together and realize the privileges of union in the widest and most comprehensive sense. Last session the whole of the North West Territory was brought into this Dominion by the almost unanimous consent of the members of this House, owing to the very satisfactory terms arranged by the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, and the hon. member for Lanark opposite.

To-day we are taking into serious consideration the desirability of adding one more link to the Confederation scheme by the taking in of British Columbia. The time then is not far distant when we shall have a greater degree of intercourse in trade and travel, and if possible a greater extension of those principles of free speech which we now enjoy with courteous personal consultation. These are the signs of the times: these are the signs by which four millions of Her Majesty's subjects, scattered over this wide spread country, recognize the importance of self government with a warm allegiance to that Sovereign who, though distant, dwells in the homes and hearts of the people of this country (cheers). It must be a source of great gratification to all interested in the prosperity of this Dominion to learn to-day the terms upon which British Columbia is to be admitted into the Union. That section of country though remote as to position is an all important one from a Dominion point of view. It possesses a most salubrious climate, well known agricultural capacity, and as to value is entirely beyond present computation both politically and commercially. In looking over the statistics of 1868, I observed that there had been no apparent increase in the population for that year beyond the children born in the country, and notwithstanding the great numbers who annually emigrate from Great Britain and various parts of Europe to the North American continent, it is surprising that with all the attractions of the Pacific section of British North America so few emigrants should have found their way there up to the present date, and more particularly so, when we consider its climate, its soil, and its resources, such as coal, iron, timber and gold. The vigorous measures about to be adopted will doubtless be the means of causing a greater tide of immigration than has been observed at any time in the history of that country. An examination of the statistics of the population of British Columbia shows the somewhat remarkable fact that the male exceeds the female population by about 277 per cent. Such an anomalous condition does not, that I am aware of, exist in any other country at the present time—in England, the United States and in Canada—precisely the reverse is the case. The wonder is that British Columbia should have attained its present prosperous condition wanting in so great a measure so material an element of success (cheers). In 1863 British Columbia was looked upon as being then, in a flourishing condition, stimulated as it was to the utmost degree of inten-

sity by the gold fever. After a time, things in general assumed a more normal state, and business on the whole gradually rested on a more substantial basis. Farms became cultivated, immense herds of cattle were raised, saw and grist mills were erected, and the lumberman's axe found its way into the magnificent forests of that ed as it was to the utmost degree of intensity, in places where a few years before such was scarcely dreamt of. Material prosperity and general advancement are now taking the place of the feverish gold excitement, which is gradually passing away. When we become possessors of British Columbia, we shall have a most magnificent inland sea of harbors such as between Vancouver and the main land. It appears as if set apart by a special Providence as a depot for the shipping of the East, and as an entrance to the great highway for all nations across the British American Continent. Doubtless, in course of time, the trade of China, Japan and the Asiatic Archipelago will centre there. This is the prize that was as anxiously sought after in ancient as it is in modern times. Persia, Assyria, Carthage and Rome prospered and held, in fact, commercial supremacy while they controlled the trade of the East. Venice, Genoa, Lisbon, Amsterdam and London each in turn held a proud commercial position, while it catered up the luxuries of the East for the Western world. This is the inheritance of the Pacific coast. We, the people of this Dominion, have every assurance that Great Britain has a warm interest in our prosperity. What better or more substantial proof could we have than the expression of the sentiment which only a few days ago flashed across the Atlantic telegraph, that England would as soon think of having itself annexed to the United States as to allow any portion of this country to be attached to the neighbouring Republic. Both England and the United States are equally well aware that the time has now arrived when that power which shall be enabled to construct the shortest route between Asia and Europe will hold the commercial supremacy of this continent in its grasp. The great trade of the East will not alone pass through the Suez Canal and the Red Sea. This is the prize which we as a people must look forward to, and certainly it is one which is well worth the endeavor to obtain. An able English writer remarks that the great benefit to be derived from the experience of the past is the application of its teaching to the present. Thus, in taking a retrospective view of Confederation, and the benefits arising out of it, even although the time is short since its inception, we

Dr. Grant.

must be cognizant of the fact that day by day we are becoming more intimately associated as a people, co-operating in every way that is possible to develop our resources. During the early discussions on the subject of Confederation, a frequent expression was "whither are we drifting." This was reiterated until at last it became irksome and unworthy of attention. The only sentiment which seemed in any way likely to form with it a twin, was the theory of independence. Both of these have had their day, and now I feel satisfied that the impression of every one who takes a warm interest in the welfare of our country, is that both these illjudged sentiments have gone down unhonored and unsung (cheers). Fortunate is it that trade has a natural and inevitable power to rectify itself. For a time after the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty this country was put to a moderate degree of inconvenience, however, the master mechanical minds and the politicians of the country, so accommodated matters and things in general as to tide that difficulty over, and now a more prosperous state of affairs exists than we have experienced for many years. As the result of the vigorous policy of those in charge of the affairs of Government, we are happy to recognize the very important fact that our Finance Minister has been so exceedingly successful in his operations as to have been enabled to bring down in his recent budget a surplus of no less than two and a half millions of dollars! Truly our Dominion under these circumstances cannot be suffering! Our merchants are not embarrassed; our young men are not leaving the country to seek employment in distant parts as formerly, and we have every assurance that the farmers of the country are reaping the benefits of their labour and industry in finding ready markets for their produce. Still further evidences of the prosperous state of our Dominion are found in the condition of our savings banks, the ordinary bank deposits, the prosperity of our municipal institutions, our increased and increasing railway traffic, our large importations and our rapidly increasing exports. All these beyond doubt, point incontrovertibly to a flourishing state of affairs throughout our Dominion at the present day. When we review the commercial history of the British American Provinces for the past thirty years, we notice that the progress of old Canada dates from the Union of the Eastern with the Western section, and has followed the construction of Canals and Railways.

The present Canal system of Canada was brought to its present condition, with all

its imperfections the finest in the world—during that period.

Twenty years ago, there were only some fifty miles of railway in operation in the Province. At present, the total number of miles of rail is nearly 3,000—one of the lines is the second longest on the Continent—the total cost of these works is nearly \$160,000,000—the total amount of their earnings cannot be less than \$13,000,000 annually. In 1841 when we commenced our canal improvements the revenue of old Canada was \$1,283,000, or \$1 per head for every man, woman and child within its limits. In 1854, the commencement of railway enterprise, it was \$5,694,000, or \$2 per head; in 1866 it was above \$12,000,000, or \$4 per head. In 1850 the population of United Canada was only 1,842,265, and the exports some \$30,000,000, or about \$15.50 for every person. At present the total population is over 3,500,000, and exports \$121,000,000, or nearly \$35 per head. Or let us illustrate the subject by reference to the Dominion. In 1843 the revenue was about \$2,000,000, whilst at the present time it is about \$15,000,000, or about \$3.50 per head of the population.

In 1806 the value of exports from all British North America was only \$9,287,940; in 1831, \$16,523,579; in 1870 it was \$73,573,490.

In 1851 the tonnage entered inwards by sea in all British North American ports was 1,590,663.

In 1870 the tonnage entered inwards by sea in the Dominion was 5,796,663.

In 1851 the tonnage cleared outwards in all British North America was 1,583,104.

In 1870 the tonnage cleared outwards in Canada was 5,619,745.

In 1806, the aggregate tonnage of British America was 71,943; in 1850, 446,935; at the present time, it is upwards of 950,000.

The expenditures have kept pace with the receipts during the period mentioned, and were devoted to a large extent to useful public works indispensable to the material development of the country. Our wealth, however, is increasing in a greater ratio than it was at the time we entered into large expenditures for canals, and our ability to go into important enterprises necessary to the expansion of Trade and Commerce is correspondingly improved.

Before closing my remarks, I would wish to allude briefly to an important union which took place some time ago in the North West Country and one which bears materially upon the prosperity of that section as far as the fur trade is concerned. The Hudson's Bay Company is an association formed, as it is well known, of two distinct elements, the stock-holders who,

as a company have other interests apart from those of fur trading; and the chief factors and chief traders known as the working partners of the fur trade portion of the concern. The stockholders are the representatives of those to whom, under the name of "the company of adventurers of England trading in the Hudson's Bay" was granted the charter by King Charles II. to trade furs, &c., in the Hudson's Bay and adjacent country. This company established a few posts near the shores of the Bay, and for years confined their operations within comparatively a short distance from the coast. In course of time they advanced into the interior, where they came in contact with other traders, of whom the most active were sent out by a company having its headquarters in Canada and known as "The North West Company." For a number of years these two rival companies competed for trade with such determination that not unfrequently when opposing parties met a conflict took place, resulting in loss of life. Under these circumstances it is not a matter of surprise that the business was found to be carried on at a considerable loss to both parties in consequence of which an Union took place. Since that time, business has been carried on to the mutual benefit and satisfaction of all parties concerned. The Factors, Traders and Officers in the service of the Company, generally may be considered Canadians as hitherto with but few exceptions, they have all either settled on the Red River, or come down to Ontario and Quebec. In dealing, therefore, with this question of the Hudson's Bay Company, it is to be hoped that the interests of these people will not be overlooked. The Fur Trade is a subject of no ordinary importance at the present time. Instead of leaving the Indians at the mercy of whoever may come in contact with them, there are but two alternatives, either of which, according to the opinion of experienced men, if adopted, might be made a source of large revenue to the Dominion. Of course it cannot be expected that the company will continue the fostering care with which it has hitherto treated the Indians in the trade operations with them. The fur country may become flooded with unscrupulous adventurers in consequence of which the company will be obliged in a great measure to abandon the practice of giving supplies to them. Without the usual advances in the autumn a great number of the unfortunate people will be obliged to abandon systematic fur hunting in order to devote their chief attention to pot-hunting to support their families and prolong their own lives. It is only in case

of competition that there is danger of the Indians suffering! When in the control of a company it will be the duty of that company to give proper supplies, which could not possibly be accomplished with rival parties scouring the country, and it is not unlikely that the scenes enacted half a century ago would under such circumstances be revived. It appears to me that some plan such as that adopted with regard to the salmon fisheries of the Lower St. Lawrence might be applicable in letting out the fur country of the North West. It is true that a few individuals might thus control the trade, but such would be vastly preferable to leaving it open to all comers from all parts of the world, which could not but prove exceedingly injurious to the trade. The existing divisions of the country into districts as recognised by the Hudson's Bay Company is of great importance, inasmuch as such districts have different tribes—a very important fact both for the Indians and the trade. If not disposed of as the salmon fisheries the whole trade might be managed by an experienced Board of Direction. This would be the best for the country, and likely under all circumstances most profitable. This trade is a subject of vast importance, for it involves the living of fully 75,000 of our fellow subjects, and nothing could be more desirable than to direct the affairs of the Indians in such a manner as may be generally acceptable to the chiefs of those great bodies. The principle must be *protection* not *extermination*. Thus, the Indians would become peaceable subjects, and warm adherents to whoever would tend most towards the welfare of the Northern fur trading country. At the lowest estimate, the value of the exports, that is including the fur obtained from British Columbia, would amount to about \$1,000,000 annually. This, if well managed, it is supposed by competent authority, would yield fully half that amount to the revenue of this Dominion. As this whole matter will, no doubt, receive the consideration of the Government, I would merely say in conclusion, that I trust the day is near at hand when British Columbia will become part and parcel of the Dominion (cheers).

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) had always been opposed to the acquisition of the North West, and to-night he heard from the hon. member for Lambton that he had good reason for that opposition. It seemed that, after all, there were only some 50,000,000 acres of habitable land in the whole territory which was capable of sustaining a population of about two millions of people, giving twenty-five acres to each person. A very different

Dr. Grant.

state of affairs to what the House had been led to believe existed. Now, after having acquired the unsettled four-fifths of the territories there, the House was asked to take possession of the remaining settled one-fifth. It seemed to him that having got the worst part of the land, having pushed our boundaries up to the verge of the wilderness, the House need hardly hesitate about extending the Dominion to the Pacific. Then, with respect to the railway, he believed it would be better to construct it with as little delay as possible, and he believed the Government policy to be the correct one.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT doubted whether \$100,000,000 was a sufficiently large estimate of the cost of constructing a Pacific Railway 2,500 miles in length. The House should consider well before taking upon the Dominion such a debt as they were now asked to bear. The present obligations of the country either actually incurred or to be incurred, amounted to not less than \$130,000,000. Then they were asked to increase it \$6,000,000 by this measure, and besides the minimum cost of the Pacific Railway, which was \$100,000,000. This would give a total debt of \$240,000,000, which would place on each family in the Dominion a debt of \$125. The result would be to ruin our credit at home and abroad. Then the Government proposed to give to this railway a grant of land amounting to 100,000 square miles—a tract of country equal to the whole New England States, or to New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio. He believed if the people of British Columbia who had shown such a liberal spirit in these negotiations, were informed that it would be physically impossible for this Dominion to undertake the construction of a railway at a cost of from \$100,000,000 and complete it within ten years, they would consent to a modification of the terms proposed to this House. He was strongly in favour of the Union and was willing to go as far as it could safely be done, to consummate Confederation by the admission of this colony into the Dominion. But the House should be careful before risking the safety of the Confederation by incurring a burden of debt under which they might sink.

Mr. YOUNG said that while he was a Unionist, he felt that the measure before the House was objectionable. He was of opinion that the Dominion should not seek to incur large indebtedness to secure the admission of British Columbia into the Union, until all the Eastern Provinces were added to the Confederation. Under any circumstances there were provisions in this Bill which were objectionable. Chief among these was the departure from the

established principle of representation. He referred to the proposed railway, and read from a report of Mr. Fleming on the subject an extract to the effect that the engineering difficulties to be overcome were startling in their magnitude, while the cost of keeping the road in running order would alone render it a formidable undertaking, being not less than \$10,000,000, and until the gross annual earnings of the line should reach \$14,000,000, the railway would not pay the expenses connected with maintaining it. Speaking of the financial aspect of the measure he quoted statements as to the charges on the Government. And the revenue to be derived, showing that British Columbia would receive \$225,000 more than she paid in, and even that calculation was contingent on the continuance of the tariff now in force, which was very uncertain. He maintained that these conditions were not fair to the rest of the Dominion, and the result would be that the finances would go back to the chronic state of deficiency that had existed some years ago.

Mr. BLAKE desired to call the attention of the House to the single point before it. As one who was always desirous that the Union should be created, and that the express objects of the Union Act, which contemplated the admission of British Columbia, should be consummated as rapidly as circumstances and prudence would permit. He retorted on those who had uttered it, the accusation that he was not desirous that the Union should be consummated. He had been at a loss to know how an Administration basing its claim to public confidence on professions of representing the Great Union Party could come down to the House with a proposition which would be fatal to the existence of Confederation. A reference to public documents, however, had convinced him that the true object of the Administration must have been to destroy all present hope of a Union on reasonable and prudent terms. His reason for this conclusion was that the Department which was naturally charged with the conduct of negotiations on this subject was under the control of a gentleman who had, some time ago, in a letter to the public of Canada, used expressions, which in him (Mr. Blake) would have been called treason, and he could not but think that the preposterous proposition of the Government with respect to the Pacific Railway, was specially framed to defeat a Union with British Columbia.

These observations were made by Mr. Howe, when he was about to assume the position of Secretary of State. These being his expounded views, written in a

deliberate letter, who could wonder that he was a party to bringing down a measure so iniquitous that the House could not help rejecting it. No wonder; then that Governor Musgrave should have stated publicly that he was amazed at the concessions granted by the Canadian Government. Were not hon. members justified then, in asking for further information before taking this irrevocable step. If this measure should become law, the faith of the Dominion would be plighted and without the consent of British Columbia could never break one jot or tittle these cast-iron obligations. But the Hon. Minister of Militia did not propose to increase the taxation of the country. Let him then put it in the bargain with British Columbia that no future misunderstandings might arise in the fulfillment of our pledge. Hon. members opposite had stated that they were willing to give 60,000,000 acres of land to aid the railway, and to pay off the interest on the debt incurred by the railway by the sale of lands in the North West. The Ontario Government had found it advisable to make free grants of their lands to settlers, instead of making a revenue from them, and the Dominion Government would find it no less difficult to derive a revenue from lands in the North West. He called upon every member in this House to consider whether he was not betraying the interests of the Dominion in ratifying this bargain which the Administration of the day had made. The fixed date of commencement and completion of the railway were dead weights on the enterprise under which the country was already staggering. They enhanced the difficulty of the undertaking. Could any country expect more than a promise to build this railway as soon as possible? Could British Columbia expect more from this Dominion? He was an advocate of Union, but under such terms as these, he considered it his duty to oppose it. He did not blame British Columbia for these unjust stipulations, but he blamed this Government for having stultified themselves by making such proposals. No solid argument could be brought against the view that the terms proposed by British Columbia and to which the colony was content to submit, should have been accepted by the Dominion Government. The amendment of the hon. member for Lambton was not in opposition to the union. The Opposition did not oppose the scheme but the unjust terms by which it was accompanied, and he could not see how any lover of his country should hesitate as to what course to take with respect to this measure.

Hon. Col. GREY rose to speak, but the hon. members were evidently wearied with

the debate, which had lasted about seven hours, and refused to listen to him. He resumed his seat amid cries of "Go on," "Question," "Adjourn," &c. After a short discussion as to whether the debate should be adjourned or continued,

Mr. BOLTON rose to explain his position with respect to this measure, and opposed the Ministerial scheme.

The debate was adjourned, and the House rose at midnight.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Mr. SHAW presented a petition from the Warden and members of the County Council of Lenark with reference to a railway from Peterboro' to Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade, praying for certain amendments to the Bill relating to weights and measures.

Hon. Mr. DEVER presented a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of St. John, N. B., praying for the abolition of the usury laws of New Brunswick.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SANBORN, the time for receiving reports of Committees on Private Bills was extended to the 8th of April.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST JUST asked when it was the intention of the Government to bring the resolutions with reference to British Columbia before the House.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the resolutions were being printed, but he was not prepared at that moment to say the exact day when the question would be brought up.

LIFE ASSURANCE.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN moved the third reading of the Bill to incorporate the Mutual Life Assurance Association, with amendments, the principal of which referred to the establishment of a guarantee fund.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

HARBOUR DUES.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON moved the second reading of the Bill intituled "An Act to extend the provisions of the Act authorizing the imposition and collection

Hon. Col. Grey.

of Harbor Dues by the Corporation of the town of Owen Sound." The Bill was intended, he stated, simply to extend the power under which the Corporation levy tolls for the improvement of the harbor. They had issued a certain amount of debentures, and they required to levy tolls for the purpose of meeting the interest on those debentures.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN did not think it advisable to legislate upon such matters, which properly fell within the purview of the local jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON explained that the question had been under the consideration of a committee of the other House, and of the Government, and it was decided that it properly fell under the jurisdiction of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT asked if the Government had come to any conclusion as to the rights of the Corporation of St. John with respect to the harbour.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL could not give an answer on the subject at that moment.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN was of opinion that the Bill was not one which Parliament had a right to consider, and that the question of jurisdiction would not be definitely settled until it came up in some shape before a Court of Justice.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN thought it but just to the promoters of the Bill to allow it to be read a second time, and then refer it to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST asked if the Government were prepared to express an opinion on the subject.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, in the absence of the leader of the Government in the House, could not speak positively on the question.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said in case of St. John, the rights were under royal charter, and alluded to some interference with those rights in the Bill recently introduced into Parliament respecting weights and measures.

Hon. Mr. DICKY said that the House itself should decide such matters, which were questions of legislation and not of executive function.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON called attention to the fact that similar Bills had passed the Legislature—one, for instance, respecting Belleville.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN referred to American authorities to show proper jurisdiction with respect to such cases, and again urged that the Bill, since it was of a municipal

nature, should come before the Local Legislature.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN recommended that the matter be referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses, in order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on all questions of a similar nature.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said that the question was one of law, and could not be properly settled by a Committee; but the Government would be prepared on the following day to state their opinions on the subject.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD did not think the House should be influenced by the opinions of the Government or of the Crown officers—the matter was one of legislation. He saw great inconvenience in allowing every municipality to levy tolls on general trade.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that the opinion of the Crown officers, however worthy of respect, could only be a matter of advice. He also saw another difficulty respecting the question. That was, the fact that the Bill asked to extend power given by an Act passed by the late Parliament of Canada.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT thought it was best to allow such matters to be carried on by those who were locally interested.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said that the Government could not control the House as to the powers of Parliament, and referred to several points in elucidation of the position he had taken on the main question at issue.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL had not meant to be understood to say that the House was bound by the opinion of the Government in respect to the powers of Parliament. His own impression was that the opinion of the Crown officers was only advisory.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

MESSAGE.

The Speaker informed the House that a message had been received from the House of Commons with the following Bills:

Bill relative to Ontario Bank. Second reading to-morrow.

Bill to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railroad. Second reading to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, March 29th, 1871.

After routine,

MANITOBA.

Mr. DONALD A. SMITH, the newly elected member for Selkirk, Manitoba, was introduced by Hon. Sir George E. Cartier and Mr. Simpson, and took his seat immediately behind Hon. Dr. Tupper's place.

Mr. MACKENZIE called attention to the fact that the hon. member who had just taken his seat did so under an Act, the confirmation of which was now being sought for at the hands of the Imperial Parliament, and as doubts existed as to the propriety of any member taking his seat under that Act, he thought that, following a precedent set by Government themselves lately, the matter should be referred to a Committee. The Opposition divested themselves of all responsibility after having given this notification.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the honourable member who had just been introduced had taken his seat under an Act of this House which had met with the sanction of the Imperial Government, and which had not been disallowed or declared null by any legal authority. Consequently if it was binding upon anybody it was on this House, which had passed the Act. But, at the same time, he might add, if any honourable member should raise a question of privilege with regard to the assumption of a seat in this House by the honourable member for Selkirk, the Government would be ready to discharge their duty and advise the House with regard to the law as it was to be applied in the present case. Until the present law should be set aside the Government could not act otherwise than they had done.

The subject was dropped.

SUPERANUATION ACT.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked why the Government had not brought down a statement of the allowances granted under the superannuation Act of last session. They should also have furnished a statement respecting confidential printing. Neither of these statements had yet been presented.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he would inquire the cause of the delay, and let the House know why the law had not yet been complied with.

THE HALIFAX PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved concurrence in the report of the Committee of Supply on the item of \$200,000 for the

erection of a Post Office and Custom House in Halifax.

Hon. Mr. DORION, with a few introductory remarks moved the following: "That the Province of Nova Scotia having recently erected a suitable building for a Custom House and Post Office at Halifax, it is inexpedient to appropriate the sum of \$200,000 for the erection of another building for the same purpose until some further attempt shall have been made to effect a settlement with the Government of Nova Scotia, in reference to their claim of \$66,000 expended since the 1st July, 1867, the payment of which sum by the Dominion Government will secure to them the possession of said building."

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved in amendment to the amendment that all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following substituted, "that the said resolution be referred back to Committee of Supply for the purpose of inserting therein after the word 'Halifax' the following words, 'or for the payment of such amount, not exceeding \$66,385, as may be awarded by Arbitrators as justly due to the Province of Nova Scotia, in case the new Provincial Building is made available for the purpose.'"

Hon. Mr. DORION said as long as the hon. members opposite were willing to accept the proposition of the Opposition, he would not oppose them. The amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia was even better than the one he (Mr. Dorion) himself had proposed, which, until to-day, the Government had opposed. He would be happy to accept the amendment (hear, hear).

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said all the difficulty in the matter had been caused by Nova Scotia, and the Dominion Government had always shown themselves anxious to settle the question.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said the Government had evidently modified their views considerably since the recent debate on this question, and he maintained the first thing to be done was for the Dominion Government to propose to submit the matter to arbitration.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought the present position of the matter should be satisfactory to both Governments, and trusted that no small differences would stand in the way of a friendly settlement.

The amendment, as amended, was carried.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the matter should be clearly understood. The Minister of Militia had accepted the principle of settlement, but proposed to take an absolute vote of the amount, but the Gov-

ernment ought to undertake not to expend any money until the result of the arbitration was ascertained.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the Government would certainly expend nothing until after arbitration.

Hon. Mr. DORION was perfectly satisfied with the action of the Government, and hoped Nova Scotia would place no obstacles in the way.

Mr. MACKENZIE could not see how the Nova Scotia Government could do so.

The House then went into Committee to amend the resolution as to this item, Mr. BLANCHET in the chair, and then rose and reported the resolution amended.

On the motion of Sir F. HINCKS, the resolution was concurred in, Hon. Mr. Holtou stating he would not object on the ground of order.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

On the motion of Sir F. Hincks, the House went into Committee of Supply, Colonel GREY in the chair.

CANAL CONSTRUCTION.

On the item of \$624,000 for construction of Canals,

Mr. MACKENZIE thought the Government should give full information on the subject.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the report of the Canal Commissioners was before the House, and the Government after considering it, had concluded not to ask a vote for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal this year. About the Welland Canal, the report recommended the raising of the Banks and locks two feet, so as to obtain 12 feet on the sills; which would cost \$300,000, they also recommended a new canal from Thorold to Port Dalhousie. The Government was ready to recommend the first proposition to the House, but they were not prepared to ask a vote for the new canal this year as the surveys were not completed. Next session, however, the Government would lay their views before the House. As to the Lower Ottawa, the House was aware that the locks of the Grenville Canal were in course of enlargement so as to allow two boats to be in the locks at once. The work that had been performed during the past year was not useless, as it would have been required for the larger locks, and the Government would ask an appropriation to make the locks, of the size recommended by the Canal Commissioners this year. The lock at St. Anne's would of course be enlarged similarly. This would be proceeded with next Fall. As to the Chats Canal the Government did not intend to enlarge it at

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

once, but would do so when practicable. The St. Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec was recommended to be deepened to 22 feet, but the Government would not ask a vote for that purpose this year, but would make investigation and report at the next session. As to the Bay Verte Canal, the surveys were not completed, and when they were reports and plans would have to be prepared and might not be ready for some months; and the Government could not therefore ask a vote, but they recognized the great importance of the work and intended to be ready at the next session to say whether they could recommend a vote. The St. Lawrence Canal would depend on what was decided on at the Welland Canals. The channel of the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario downwards, however, required improvement and an appropriation would be asked in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) asked why the Murray Canal had not been treated of.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said this canal was not included in the report, and he had not therefore referred to it. The Government had not, however, decided to proceed with it.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked what amount was involved in the proposed expenditure.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN could not give the exact figures, but the Welland Canal would probably require \$300,000, the Lower Ottawa \$200,000 or \$250,000 and the Upper St. Lawrence about \$100,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE spoke of the deepening of the St. Lawrence above Montreal, and thought some particulars should be given as to the points at which the work would be required.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said when the votes came down he would give all information, but could not do so now.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT asked whether these sums were additional to what had been already voted for the Welland Canal and the Lower Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said they were.

In reply to Mr. MERRITT,

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Lake Erie level would not be obtained by the proposed work.

Mr. MERRITT thought the proposed expenditure would be thrown away if the Grand River should but furnish enough water.

Mr. McCALLUM (Monck) asked whether £300,000 would give 12 feet of water in the Welland Canal.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said yes, it would.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that generally speaking the plan met his approval, but regretted that a vote had not been asked for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. The enlargement of the Ottawa, he considered absolutely necessary, but Canada ought to be rendered entirely independent of the United States. The plan taken by the Commission was the only one that could be taken, and the Government might well have arrived at the same result without the expense of the Commission. The Welland Canal when increased would doubtless be sufficient for all the wants of trade. The Commission, however, had not referred to the best mode of carrying produce destined for foreign countries. His own view was that a transshipment at the Welland Canal would be an advantage as it would benefit the grain and prevent it from heating. The experience of sending vessels from the West to Foreign Ports was very unfavorable. The Commissioners had not referred to the want of accommodation for produce at Quebec and Montreal, and many shippers would send their goods by New York on account of the difficulties at Montreal. At New York, there was every facility, and he might mention that not a single vessel had loaded from Montreal with petroleum, simply in consequence of the lack of accommodation. Private enterprise had done much, but it was for the Government to consider what could be done to accommodate produce at Montreal, and he was surprised that attention had not been called to so important a matter. With regard to the Welland Canal, he did not think it necessary to proceed immediately with the enlargement proposed for Canadian trade only, and unless it was certain that such an enlargement would induce a large amount of foreign traffic. He had always considered that if the Western produce was to be conducted in barges, the route of the Ottawa was decidedly the best, and he thought that barge navigation would be the best and cheapest that could be adopted. On the other hand, the canals could be utilized for years to come, and he was not inclined to ask for the construction of works not necessary. The future, however, should be looked to, and if the Americans should enter into closer connection with Canada, it would, no doubt, be necessary to enlarge the Welland Canal; so as to accommodate American trade. He thought the plan of the new canal was good. The requirements of the mining trade on Lake Superior ought also to be considered, for there would soon be an enormous shipment of ores from that District. The Commissioners had not spoken of the Rideau Canal, although it was known that when

the Ottawa and St. Lawrence had been, navigable, that canal had fallen into comparative disuse, and it should be considered whether the amount annually expended could not be saved. The opening of the Upper Ottawa would conduce more than anything to developing and improving the country, and was sorry the Government had gone no further than propose to improve a few local works, as he thought they ought to be able to initiate a distinct policy on the subject, making the present appropriations a mere commencement of an ultimate plan.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN stated that the works being now undertaken were really only part of the plan proposed by the Commissioners.

Mr. MACKENZIE was glad such was the case, and he asked the serious attention of the Government to what he had indicated as to the want of accommodation at Montreal. Those engaged in developing the mineral resources of the West were daily complaining on this subject.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the defective arrangements at Montreal certainly deserved consideration. He referred to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and admitted its importance, he thought that, considering the present negotiations at Washington, a plan to construct that work would really be a doubtful policy. He read an extract from the papers before the House, being a minority report from Mr. Laidlaw, showing that as the recommendation of the Commission was that the canal should be built on the same plan as the Welland Canal, it would not be large enough for the vessels passing through the American Canal, that no tolls would be obtained, and would not be of the slightest possible use except in case of war. Of course the Government had not adopted this view, but they thought it inadvisable to proceed with the work at present.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that such were the facilities for constructing the Canadian Canal that if it were built it would be used at once to its utmost capacity, and he regarded Mr. Laidlaw's report as most puerile.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal) spoke of the want of accommodation at Montreal, and explained the way in which the Harbour was worked, and he was sure that the Harbour Commissioners had done everything that could be expected of them. As to the petroleum, the absence of shipments arose from the nature of the article itself, but as regarded the staple products of the country, matters were conducted more cheaply, more efficiently and more expeditiously than at any other port on the continent, and he had heard many

Mr. Mackenzie.

Captains of vessels testify to such being the case. Of course he would not object to Government aid but certainly he would not ask for it.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal) thanked the member for Lambton for having drawn attention to the matter, but could not agree with his colleague from Montreal. The Harbour Commissioners might have done what they could, but if that body were differently constituted, very much more might have been done.

The Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

The Act incorporating the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company was passed through Committee, Colonel Grey in the Chair.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.]

Hon. Colonel GREY resumed the debate on the Bill to admit British Columbia into the Dominion. He said that it mattered little how this House might regard the measure unless they were backed up by public opinion, and that opinion was greatly affected by statements made in this House. The measure should be viewed by the light of the ledger, in the practical light of the present day, rather than in the light of the past. This House should regard it too, in the light of the experience of the neighboring Republic, and see how we might profit by it. As had been observed by the honourable member for Sherbrooke, there were two precautions to be taken. The constitution was in no way to be infringed and the Dominion was not to incur a financial burden too heavy to be borne. In this view, he believed every member in the House concurred. And first, with regard to the objection urged against the representation of British Columbia that it was too large, he would say that the British North America Act did not limit representation to the white population but even if it were so limited, the number of representatives under the circumstances of that Colony was not too great. When the Manitoba Act was passed last session exception was taken in the debate to the representation given to the new Province, but the reply was that the expected increase in the population would, within a very short period, be proportionate to the representation. This view was not disputed by the hon. member for East Toronto, or by his hon. friend from Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS—I did dispute it.

Hon. Col. GREY would quote from the

hon. member's own speech to show that he had not objected to it.

Mr. MILLS said he would not accept any report made last year as a correct one.

Hon. Col. GREY would quote from the *Globe* report, which the hon. member would hardly object to. The passage of the hon. member's speech referred to, contained the following: "The representation was based no doubt, on the expectation of an immediate increase of the inhabitants, but he contended that it would be better to give representation to the number of people, increasing the number if it was thought best, every two years, or leaving to the local legislature if they thought it better." Here was the expression of opinion from the hon. member, and thus, though the point was raised, there was no record on the journals of the House, no action taken, no resolution or amendment moved to show that the representation of Manitoba was unconstitutional. The objection that was taken in debate last session by the honourable gentleman was as to the power of the Parliament to give representation at all—not as to its numerical character. Here then was a precedent for this case before the House—a precedent established by the House itself. He had no fear that the smaller Provinces would be overridden through this Act. If the representation were to be based strictly upon population according to the law as at present interpreted by the honourable member for Bothwell, British Columbia would have but one representative, if any. Now, in that colony there were two separate and distinct interests, the insular and continental. The country was divided into two sections, Vancouvers Island and the main land. If the colony were permitted to send but one member to this House, which section would he represent? He could not represent both very well, and one of them would remain unrepresented. It was clear, therefore, that no other course could have been adopted with reference to this point, than that embodied in the measure before the House. The position he took with reference to this question was this, that until the Province became a member of the Federal compact, it would not be governed by the provisions of the British North America Act. That the terms and conditions on which British Columbia came in were to be agreed on, and if as an independent province she chose to say her interests required four representatives in the House, she could, and there was nothing in the British North America Act to prevent our acceptance of such a proposition, but after she came in, her future representation must be governed by the

31st section of the British North America Act, and must revolve like that of the other Provinces, around the representation of Quebec as a pivot. In accepting her therefore, as set forth in the resolutions in that respect there was no infringement of our Constitutional rights under the British North America Act, and thus the first point stated by the member from Sherbrooke was complied with. For it must be assumed that if there were other important constitutional objections they would not have escaped the acumen of the member for West Durham. The next point was as to our capability to enter upon the contemplated arrangements respecting the Pacific Railway. The necessity, of course of communication with the Pacific was admitted by every hon. member who had spoken on this subject. The Government did not propose to build the railway themselves, but it would be done by companies, and if the land grants should prove nearly as valuable as it was alleged they would, the cry of one hundred millions which was used to create so much alarm would prove to be a mere bugbear. With regard to the part of the line falling in Ontario he was not prepared to speak, but with respect to the other portions he desired to say something. The hon. gentleman here described the mode and means by which the Pacific Railway from Omaha to Sacramento was built, shewing the companies, the land grants, and Government Bond subsidies in aid, describing the character of the country, and the difficulties which met the constructors of the road, the unstable nature of the soil about the Missouri River, the arid character of the American desert, and the Alkali plains, the elevation of the passes of the Rocky Mountains, and of the Sierra Nevada Range, and went on to explain how the Government Bond subsidies were divided, increasing proportionately with the cost of construction of different parts thus preventing the Government aid being entirely used on the easy gradient, and thereby obviating further calls on the Government. The American Government had divided the subsidy, giving one amount for the easy part of the line, and a larger amount for the difficult sections. The whole bond subsidy amounted to fifty-eight millions, and in addition a land grant was made of alternate lots of 20 miles along the route. The cost of the American road had also been largely increased to the extent of twenty millions by a stipulation that no rails should be used except those of *home* make,—a limitation which would certainly not be imposed by us—as our rule was to buy in the cheapest market.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he supposed steel rails would be used.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER—The honorable gentleman knows better.

Hon. Col. GREY resumed his description of the construction of the American line, and the difficulties met with in that work. He quoted from a speech of the member for Lambton made last session during the Manitoba debate, shewing that the Canadian line would pass through an infinitely better country than that through which the American line had passed.

Mr. MACKENZIE said his words had applied to the portion lying between Red River and the Rocky Mountains.

Hon. Col. GREY said he admitted that he had spoken in that limited sense, but that covered 1,400 miles of the distance. As the American line had been built at an expense of sixty millions, what fear need there be as to the cost of the Canadian line, which would pass through an infinitely better country, and the elevation to be attained would be much less. (The honourable gentleman here read extracts of Cheadle & Milton's work, shewing that whereas the highest elevation of the American line was 7,400 and 8,000 feet above the level of the sea. The Jasper House or Yellow Dead Pass through the Rocky Mountains, with us was only 3,760 feet, with a gradual slope on either side; and also showing the nature and character of the country on this side of the Rocky Mountains, and of the valley of the Fraser River on the other.) It had been alleged that the line must necessarily be built within ten years, and that if a company would not undertake it, the Government would be obliged to do it. Now, the Americans had built their line in three and a half years, and could it be supposed that Canadians were so inferior that they could not build a line of comparatively easy construction in ten years. And in the light of the experience of that country, how could it be said companies would not be found to build the line. British Columbia possessed every means of becoming one of the most prosperous Provinces in the Dominion, and indeed its union had been one of the stipulations of, and inducements for Confederation. He then spoke of the prosperous condition of the Dominion at present, to show that Canada need have no fear of the responsibility it was proposed to incur, and referred to statistics to prove his position. The member for Durham had based his statements that Canada could not bear the burden to be laid on her, under the impression that the Dominion would have to pay one hundred millions, but that was not the case. There was

a vast difference between the burden of a work of that amount—say 100,000,000 borne by various parties—public Companies—land grants and aids of different characters—and the cost of the same work borne by one exchequer. It was not intended that the exchequer or revenues of Canada should bear the charge of the work, but simply that they would aid it. If Canada should refuse to give this aid, the work would pass out of her hands, British Columbia would not be included, and the Dominion, instead of becoming a great and leading power on the continent, and advancing in material wealth and prosperity, would revert to its old position of discontented and opposing Provinces, small and insignificant—the worse for having thrown away the opportunities which had been afforded her (cheers).

Mr. JOLY (Lotbiniere) said when he had listened to the discussion, he could not help thinking of the fable of the frog and the ox. The frog had admired the size of the ox, and deciding that it was its duty to become as large as the ox, it went on swelling until it burst, and when he had heard the description and glowing terms of the Minister of Militia, he thought he could see the Dominion swell like the frog. It was very fortunate the Pacific made a boundary to the land to be annexed, although it was true China and Japan were beyond, and perhaps the Pacific might yet be made a Canadian sea. When the Minister of Militia had named fifty two millions as the cost of the railway, he could only have referred to the cost to the Dominion, and in the same way the population had been much exaggerated.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER had stated the population correctly at 63,000, being 15,000 to 17,000 Europeans, some 5,000 Chinese and the remainder Indians.

Mr. JOLY must, of course, admit his mistake. He could not consider the railway a Canadian but an Imperial Policy, and, of course, it was natural that England should desire to see British North America confederated and independent of the United States, and if that was her desire, the best thing she could do would be to aid in constructing this line of communication. The great advantage Canada possessed over the States, was her freedom from debt and taxation, but if, to the present debt of \$100,000,000, was added another \$100,000,000 for the construction of the railway, the debt of Canada would become in proportion almost as large as that of the United States, and Canada would lose her only advantage. He came to the conclusion that an additional debt of \$100,000,000 would be mentioned on account of

Hon. Col. Grey.

the construction of the railway, from the remarks of the member for St. John. The Americans had paid fifty eight millions of dollars as a subsidy, and had made twice as large a land grant; the money grant would have to be larger. For years to come, the line could not pay a tenth part of its cost, and no Company would undertake it unless they received every assistance, for the line would not obtain anything like the traffic that the Union Pacific obtained, and he believed the result would be that the Government itself would have to build the line. As to the time that would be required to build the line, if the same energy were shown as had been exhibited in the construction of the Intercolonial, the Pacific would take twenty years. Why not say to British Columbia, "we are willing for you to join us, but we cannot pledge ourselves to this heavy expenditure—but if British Columbia only wanted to see which Country, Canada or the States would give them the best terms, he, for one, was not prepared to buy them in that way. The present position of Canada and the States to each other could not last much longer, and if more friendly relations should be established, why should not Canada avail herself of the Northern Pacific road until she was able to build a line for herself.

Mr. JACKSON was glad to see the unanimity of belief that union with British Columbia was a necessity, and that the construction of a line of railway was also a necessity. It had been conceded that the amount to be granted to British Columbia was not extravagant, but objection was taken as to the mode of payment. Objection had also been raised that the proposed representation was too large for the population, but looking at the matter in a common sense view only, although the abstract principle of representation according to population might be right, he thought area should enter into the arrangement, and he saw nothing in the objection. As to the objection of the railway having to be constructed in ten years, British Columbia was to be taken into the Union, and the understanding was that the whole Dominion should be connected. The responsibility might be great, but in all agreements certain conditions were implied, which might operate to change the agreement. If the present prosperity continued, there was no reason to doubt the ability of the Government to construct the railway within ten years, but if circumstances should prevent that, what danger could ensue? He should certainly support the resolutions of the Government on the grounds he had stated. Some years ago he had entertained doubts of the success of Confederation, but he was very glad to

see how satisfactory the results had been. He thought the definiteness of the proposition for the construction of the line, would obtain for it greater consideration and greater confidence on the part of English capitalists. He would not try to foreshadow the future, but there was every reason for hope. The member for Lotbiniere had said that the increased responsibility would make Canada's debt equal to that of the United States, but the view was most erroneous, for while the Canadian line would open up a splendid country and consolidate the country, the Americans had only destroyed property and desolated homes without result.

Mr. MILLS would not have spoken but for the remarks of the member for St. John. That hon. gentleman entirely misapprehended the system of Government provided by the British North American Act. He disputed his reading of the constitution as affecting powers and duties of Canada in relation to colonies to be admitted into the Union. He had contended the Indians should be embraced in framing the basis for representation. That had not, however, been done as regards the other Provinces. The Indians did not enter into the social bond, and could not stand on the same footing as the white population. The member for St. John argued that because the principle of representation by population had been violated in the treatment of Manitoba, it should be in the case of British Columbia, and he had stated representation by population was not the principle established by the constitution, but the Union Act plainly showed it was, and the representation was to be altered every ten years in harmony with the growth of the country in population, and in a prescribed relation to the sixty-five members always to be possessed by Quebec. In answer to the member for St. John, he contended that the phraseology of the Union Act proved that the terms applicable to the four Provinces of the Confederation as to representation, applied to the Provinces afterwards admitted. The Union could be extended only on the federal principle, and the principle he now contended for governed his objections to the Manitoba Bill last year. He held now as before that the very principle of our constitution was violated in the terms we granted that Province last year, that we had no authority to grant her representation beyond that to which by population she was entitled. So much for the precedent cited by that hon. gentleman. He did not believe British Columbia would complain of our altering terms before us in obedience to our reasonable wishes and interests if she was prepared to accept reasonable

terms he would not oppose her entrance into the Union. If she was not so prepared, it would simply show the time had not come for her admission. As to the remark that we ought to be able to construct a railroad in less than ten years, and that the Americans constructed theirs in three years and a half, it was apparently forgotten that their railroads previously extended a thousand miles further west than ours, that they had thirty millions this side the Rocky Mountains against our four, and had a large population on the Pacific coast and infinitely greater resources on both sides the Rocky Mountains than ours. He would like to know how we could build it in ten years when at the present rate of progress, and with our adequate means and other advantages the Intercolonial would require seven years. At its rate of construction, it would take 37 years to build the Pacific Road. He was convinced we should not draw so largely upon the future, should not incur obligations we had no certainty of being able to meet. On this ground alone, were there no other objections to the resolutions, he would be disposed to oppose them. The geological survey of the country was an incident of the local possession and management of the lands, and it should be undertaken by the local authorities alone. We had no power to enter upon this work, the proposal of which was another instance of the irregular or illegal Acts we were asked to perform. He would oppose the resolutions and support the very proper amendment before the House.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN then proceeded to explain in French the proposals and policy of the Government on this subject, and to recite the circumstances that led to the submission of this scheme, dating back to the period of Confederation. He reminded the House that these terms had been accepted by the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia on the understanding that they would not be altered by the Parliament of Canada. In reply to the hon. member for Sherbrooke and other gentlemen, he contended that the present terms were not less favourable to Canada than the former, because in the first instance the colony was to have four senators at Ottawa and eight Commoners, while now she was allowed but three of the former and six of the latter. With regard to the railway, he urged that there was no comparison between the Intercolonial and the Pacific road, because it would not be undertaken by the Government but by a company upon the basis of a liberal land grant and an annual payment of money within the means of Canada, and without augmenting its debt.

Mr. Mills.

Mr. GEOFFRION—Suppose you don't find a company?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—Who could doubt their finding a company with the double inducement of land and money, when in the States and other countries railways were begun and completed on the basis of land grants only? We were bound, irrespective of British Columbia, to construct a railway to the Rocky Mountains, certainly through a magnificent country for hundreds of miles; but what would be the use of stopping there? Would it not be to a certain extent money ill-spent, when the road stopped short of the natural boundary of the Dominion, of the natural ocean outlet on the Pacific? Our interests undoubtedly dictated that prolongation. He maintained that in a revenue point of view Canada would not lose by this measure, for, as had been pointed out, the consumption of dutiable goods per head of the population was much greater than in Canada. There was already a population of 60,000, including Chinese and Indians, many of whom were civilized and useful inhabitants. He denied the statement of the member for Lotbinière that we already owed \$100,000,000, our debt being but \$80,000,000, and as the Government intended having the railway built by a private company they could incur nothing like another hundred millions of debt. As to the pension list, several of the recipients could be made useful to the Dominion as public officers. It was absurd to suppose Canada could depend on the American Northern Pacific Railway, and if we wished to extend our population and trade and colonize our vast Western region, we must possess a railroad through our own territory, instead of travelling westward by one 100 or 200 miles from our frontier. It was necessary to satisfy the Columbians, as well as to give confidence to British capitalists, that a period should be fixed for the completion of the road; but if in seven or eight years it should appear, with representatives from that Province sitting among us, that despite our good faith and utmost efforts it was impossible to complete the work within the time named they could not and would not find fault with us. He did not anticipate any failure, but looked at the worst contingency. He believed it was our duty and our interest too, to complete Confederation and establish a British empire in North America, with the freest institutions in the world, under the British Flag now protecting us, and which would continue to protect us so long as we desired. He believed his countrymen of all origins and classes desired this result, and that trifling difficulties should not induce them to abandon reasonable effort

for its attainment. British Columbia did not merit the treatment proposed by the amendment and he hoped the House would not refuse to adopt cheerfully the resolutions of the Government [cheers.]

Hon. Mr. SMITH thought the subject was one of the greatest magnitude, and Government ought to have absolved all parties to allow every one to give the matter the freest possible consideration. He had at first done his best to oppose Confederation but he was now friendly to the Union, and would be glad to see the whole of British North America united. There were two very important considerations—one was that there was a great departure from the principles of the constitution in the matter of the representation. With regard to the financial aspect, however, he could not but believe that lasting injury would be done to the country by the expenditure to be incurred. The cost of the railway could not be less than \$100,000,000, and it was equivalent to the Imperial Government asking England to embark in an enterprise involving a thousand millions. Was not the matter, therefore, sufficiently grave to merit the most serious consideration—and he intreated the Government to pause. The faith of the country was pledged by the resolution to complete the railway within ten years, no matter if the result should be ruin. No verbal reservations could have effect, the written record alone could hold, and the words of the resolution were clear, and if in two years the railway was not commenced, British Columbia could appeal to the Imperial Government. They had been told that the expenditure would not burden the people, but could that be believed, and no one would undertake to say that a Company would undertake the work as a remunerative scheme, and, therefore, sooner or later, the Government would have to pay every dollar of the expense, and the contractors would want the land as a profit. No one could suppose that even after the road was built, it would pay one tenth of its working expenses, and how, therefore, could British capitalists be expected to undertake the work. The Minister of Customs had intimated that if they did not strike quickly, they would alienate British Columbia from the enterprise, but was that an element for discussion, no, if such were the case, the matter belonged to the Imperial Government only. Was the House ready to involve the country in so large an increase of debt. That debt was already \$100,000,000, and there were many burdens that would arise from the Intercolonial and other works. The Union Act had provided for the extension of the Canal system and that had only been delayed because of the deficient state

of the finances of the Dominion. The cost of the railway could not be named, it might be much greater than the amount named, and yet *coute qui coute* the country would stand pledged to complete it. He should oppose the measure because it would impose burdens on the people that they were not able to bear and would involve the country in ruin and disaster.

Mr. RYMAL like the previous speaker, had not much faith in the blessings of Confederation, and should oppose the present measure, because he believed it violated their constitutional rights. In the Confederation scheme the principle of representation by population had been conceded, and yet that principle was now being violated. The Minister of Militia himself represented many times the whole number of white men in British Columbia, and there were many similar cases in the House, and the thing was so absurd and unjust that if it were the only objection, he would oppose the scheme for while he asked nothing more than justice, he would take nothing less. As to the financial aspect the responsibilities about being incurred, added to the cost of Intercolonial and the enlargement of the canals, a debt of \$300,000,000, would be incurred, which at five per cent. would involve an annual expenditure of \$15,000,000. Added to this there would be the yearly and ever increasing burden of maintaining the railway, all of which would fall on the poor tax payers. To use a well known phrase, he would say, "whither are we drifting," and the only answer was that bankruptcy and ruin stared them in the face, and the credit and good reputation of Canada would be a thing of the past. The Minister of Finance had well nigh ruined the country before, and he would do so again, if the present Ministry retained their seats, and were led on by the Minister of Finance. Language failed him to express his detestation of the Government that thus prejudiced the good interests of the country, and it appeared to him that the prospects of the Confederation were being destroyed.

Hon. C. DUNKIN said the question proposed was the adoption of resolutions for the admission of British Columbia into the Union, and the objection raised in the amendment was a very narrow one. No sufficient reason was given for the postponement proposed, which was in effect the adjournment of the whole scheme. He referred to the circumstances connected with Confederation, and the feelings with which it was regarded at first, and after its accomplishment. The experiment was tried, one of

its express objects being to bring in the British North West Territory, and construct a Railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and were they now to hesitate letting *I dare not wait upon I would*. He argued that British Columbia and the North West could not be retained without a railway. They had already incurred the greater part of the expenditure, independent of British Columbia, and they must advance, they could not recede. Without executing the policy these Resolutions embodied we should expose ourselves, our present constitution and national position. Not to advance was to go back the whole distance. He argued that the road could be built to the Pacific at a cheaper rate than one to the Rocky Mountains only, and possibly for a smaller amount than to this point.

Mr. BODWELL rose to speak, but was interrupted by cries of "adjourn." After a short discussion the debate was adjourned, to be resumed to-morrow after recess, and the House rose 12.50 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1871:

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented the sixth report of the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, stating that the Committee found sufficient notice had been given in the case of the petition of S. Waddell and others of Montreal; and the petition of W. Workman and others, of the same place.

INTEREST.

Hon. Mr. DEVER said if he would be permitted to trespass on the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, he would feel disposed to state that he thought according to the British North America Act, all parties in this Dominion had a right to expect that a uniform rate of interest should be introduced through all the parts of this Dominion, with as much despatch as was the assimilation of other important questions that have been passed for the good government of the country. His object at present was to say that a great deal of dissatisfaction is felt at the seemingly unnecessary delay of the Government in bringing forward a measure of this kind, so that no obstruction may be continued any longer in any part of the Dominion against the free and unrestricted intercourse of business rela-

Hon. C. Dunkin.

tions. Now, he would appeal to all, but more especially to the Government to look at the strange anomaly of several rates of interest at present prevailing in the Dominion. In one Province it was said, the legal rate is confined to 6 per cent. In another 6 per cent., and as much more as the parties agree on. In a third, on mortgages 6 per cent. and as much more as you could get, if not disputed in law, and so on, until he thought there was hardly a man in this country who could tell exactly the precise rate of interest obtaining at present in all the provinces of this Dominion, without having to read through four sets of Provincial Statutes to find it out. That they might see that this state of affairs was causing commotion amongst the business men and others of some of the large cities of the lower provinces, he would ask permission to read an extract from one of the leading papers of the city of St. John, setting forth the views of the Chamber of Commerce of that place, on this subject, and how that body of merchants, bankers and others expect the Government will see to this matter with as much zeal as they have shown in obtaining the equalization of all the other conflicting laws that prevailed in the several provinces during the beginning of Confederation. Here the honorable member read from a newspaper the action of the St. John Chamber of Commerce in this matter, and pressed on the Government the desirability of keeping in view the wishes of so large and intelligent a body of merchants, bankers, and others, now so anxious to have a Dominion interest law, similar to that at present obtaining in the Province of Ontario. With these remarks, he asked the Government: Whether it is the intention during the present Session of Parliament to introduce any Bill or Measure for the regulation of a common rate of interest on all Monetary and Mercantile transactions, within the several provinces, now comprising the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL agreed with the honorable gentleman that it was very desirable that the rate of interest should be assimilated throughout the Dominion; but there were many difficulties in the way, arising out of the diverse views entertained on the subject in another branch. Under these circumstances the Government were not prepared during the present Session to introduce a Bill for the regulation of Interest, although they admitted the importance of the question and had no doubt it would be dealt with sooner or later.

MESSAGE.

A message was received from the House

of Commons, stating that they had passed the following Bills :

To incorporate the Toronto Corn Exchange. Second reading on Monday.

To incorporate the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company. Second reading on Monday.

THE FENIAN INVASION.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill (from House of Commons) to indemnify members of Government for expenses incurred in connection with the Fenian invasion.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN asked the government if there was any prospect of the Dominion itself being indemnified for the expenditure of the money in question.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the expenses incurred had been put in the shape of a claim or statement, which had been submitted to the High Commission. Supposing the matter was not considered by that body, then it would remain for the Government of the Dominion to place the circumstances clearly before the Imperial Government with the view of ascertaining whether under the circumstance, they would not at all events assist in the payment of the amount which the Fenian invasion had compelled us to pay [hear, hear].

The motion was carried.

HARBOUR DUES.

Hon. Mr. READ moved the second reading of the Bill to enable the village of Trenton to impose, and collect Harbour dues, and for other purposes. The Bill, he stated, was similar to the one submitted on the previous day.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he understood that his hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had stated during the previous afternoon, that the Government would be prepared when they again met to give an opinion on the constitutional point. In compliance with that promise, he would state the opinion which was held by the Government under the advice of the Minister of Justice. Legislation of the kind in question was not new—it had come up time and again since the formation of the Confederation. For instance, during the session of 1867-8, Acts were passed in relation to the harbour of Quebec, and harbour police; in 1869, with respect to harbour and channels, and harbour of Quebec; in 1870, with regard to improving harbours, Quebec harbour, Corporation of Collingwood (to collect tolls at mouth of Beaver River.) Belleville harbour (to collect tolls); Quebec

harbour again. In the Supply Bill of 1868 there were the following items:—

Montreal River Police, chargeable against Harbour Commissioners, Quebec Harbour Police :

Harbours, Lake Huron.....	\$ 8,000
Harbours, Piers and Lights.....	120,000
Harbour Police, Montreal.....	11,628
River Police, Quebec.....	11,812
Harbours and Piers.....	50,000

IN THE SUPPLY BILL, 1870.

Harbour Police, Quebec and Montreal ;	
Harbours, Lakes Erie and Huron, \$100,000	
Mabou Harbour.....	8,000
Coteau au Lac Pier.....	4,000
Piers below Quebec.....	
Richibucto Harbour.....	4,000
Amherst Harbour.....	
House Harbour, Magdalen Island.....	4,000
Bathurst Harbour.....	2,000
Steam Dredges, &c.....	

In all the foregoing cases, the hon. gentleman went on to say, the harbour had been considered as properly coming within the jurisdiction of Parliament. He believed that certain proceedings had taken place in the Legislature of Quebec declaring that such matters came properly within the purview of the General Legislature. He did not mean to assert that the matter was quite clear as respects the constitutionality of the Act. Not until a series of years had passed, and the subject had been presented in a variety of aspects, would the point be clearly settled. Neither did he mean to say that he could quote any precise language from the Act which showed clearly that there was power given to Parliament to deal with such questions. In section 91, however, power was given to the Legislature of the Dominion in relation to all matters not coming within the legislative functions of the Provinces. He did not find in the enumeration of subjects given to the Local Governments any item which precluded the interpretation which the Government and Parliament had hitherto given to the point. It might be said that "Local Works and undertakings" referred to the class of questions in controversy—so the same argument might be used with respect to "Civil rights;" but it seemed most reasonable that these cases before the House might be classed as touching navigation and shipping, and the regulation of trade, subjects under the jurisdiction of the general Legislature. In the schedule of the Act, there was mention made of "public harbours," which are the property of the Dominion. Harbours of refuge might be classed among such; but he did not base his conclusions on that part of the Act so

much as on the other items just mentioned.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN mentioned that certain acts had been passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick with respect to the harbour of St. John, and had received the sanction of the Minister of Justice, since they had been regularly assented to.

Hon. Mr. MILLER did not think it allowable for the Local Legislature to have the power of legislating on matters affecting general trade and commerce.

Hon. Mr. PERRY called the attention of the House to what he considered were objectionable features of the Bill. For instance, it was provided that tolls should be levied not only on property landed within the limits of the harbour, but on all timber coming down the river Trent and merely passing through. Again it was proposed to make the vessels liable for the tolls on the goods they landed; in case of non-payment, the vessels might be detained.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY argued in favour of having some fixed rule to guide the House with respect to such matters, and added that his own opinion entirely agreed with that of the Postmaster General as regards the interpretation of the Union Act.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that there ought to be a clear distinction made between public and private harbours; the former certainly came within the jurisdiction of the Parliament. In the provisions of the Bill before the House, he saw a direct infringement of the powers of the local legislature. We should find a line of demarcation, where our powers began and ended. The clause referring to Trade and Commerce, in his opinion, referred to matters affecting more than one Province, or foreign countries. In the present case, the matter was of a purely local character.

Hon. Mr. FLINT agreed with the previous speaker who had pointed out the most objectionable features of the Bill—that clause especially which taxed the lumbering interest, and referred to the injurious effect of the Bill passed in a previous session with respect to Belleville.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER hoped that the Committee to whom the Bill would be submitted, would thoroughly consider the preamble and see that it was proved before agreeing to its passage. He believed that all navigable rivers and harbors are public property, unless by some Act of Parliament or by local charter, they were placed in a different position. He believed that the hon. Postmaster General was, in the main, correct in the principle he laid down. In the case, however, even of a harbor given

special rights by charter, it was subject to legislation by the Dominion for general purposes of trade.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN agreed with the doctrine laid down by the leader of the Government, but was sorry that the hon. gentleman had not dealt more generally with the subject. He also added his regret that the proposition he (Mr. Allan) had made on the previous day—to refer the whole question to a Joint Committee, had not been entertained.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD called attention also to the injustice of the provisions respecting tolls on the large quantity of timber that came down the Trent every season.

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE said that he was certainly of opinion that there should be some definite rule laid down with respect to such matters, and expressed his surprise to see Bills concerning purely local harbours coming before the general Legislature, whereas in the Maritime Provinces, they were invariably dealt with by the local Legislatures. It was quite certain that if Parliament was to take charge of all harbours—large and small—much embarrassment must ensue. In his opinion, the Local Legislature had the best means of informing themselves on such matters.

Hon. Mr. CHURCHILL alluded to the peculiarities of different classes of harbours, and questioned the propriety of the Parliament dealing with such matters as that before the House.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON said that ever since Confederation had come into operation Parliament had taken upon itself to legislate with respect to harbours, and considered it would be manifestly unfair to change the practice suddenly, without giving notice to all parties interested.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT was of the opinion that matters touching harbours should be within the jurisdiction of those who had some knowledge concerning them.

After some further remarks from hon. gentlemen the motion was carried, and the Bill referred to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

RAILWAY BRIDGES.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill to exempt railway companies from building draw bridges over rivers in certain cases. The Bill proposed, he explained, when a chartered company wished to cross a navigable rivers, notice should be given in the *Gazette* and local newspapers. The Governor in Council was, then, to consider and grant the application and to regulate the style of structure; but under no circum-

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

stances could they interfere with the navigation of a river.

Hon. Mr. RYAN considered the present measure less objectionable than the one introduced in the first instance, but nevertheless he was strongly of opinion that navigable rivers should be protected. It was still objectionable to give the power in question to the Governor in Council—he preferred leaving it in the hands of the Legislature. In this connection he read from the Memorial of the Montreal Board of Trade (laid on the table on a former day), protesting against the previous Bill, and also referred to the opinions of persons in Ottawa and elsewhere, who were of the belief that it was unwise of the Legislature to abrogate their right of dealing with such matters.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER was in favor of the Bill, but thought two months notice should be given.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN thought other Companies beside Railway Corporations, might be included.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD spoke of the necessity of carefully guarding the interests of a river like the Ottawa, where he expected to see a canal constructed in the course of time, notwithstanding the report of the Commissioners.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that it was explicitly laid down in the Bill that nothing whatever should be done to interfere in any way with the navigation of a river.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN suggested the insertion of a provision to prevent interference with the floating of rafts—a very important provision in the case of a river like the Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the amendment might be very properly added in Committee.

After a few remarks from Hon. Mr. RYAN, and from Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL in explanation,

The motion was carried, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole on Monday next.

ONTARIO BANK.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON moved second reading of the Bill (from the House of Commons) to amend the charter of the Ontario Bank. The object of the Bill is simply to explain an Act passed by Parliament two sessions ago.

The motion was carried, and the Bill referred to the Committee on Banking, Railways and Commerce.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1871.

After routine,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER presented a statement of vessels chartered for the use of the Red River Expedition.

MUNICIPAL FUND.

Mr. LAPUM asked whether it is the intention of the Government to pay the Municipalities of the former Province of Upper Canada (now Ontario) the amounts due under the Municipalities Fund, irrespective of the default of G. Reiffenstein, now imprisoned in the Penitentiary for having appropriated a portion of those monies?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that it was not the intention of the Government that any municipality should suffer through these frauds.

Mr. RYAN moved for papers and reports having reference to the construction of culverts on the Lachine Canal since last session—Carried.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Mr. MILLS resolution declaring it expedient that Orders in Council, Departmental regulations and proclamations of a permanent character having the force of law be printed each year in the same manner as the Statutes of Canada.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER read a report from the Queen's Printer showing they would cost, if printed separately, \$5,720, and if bound up with the Statutes a saving of half the press-work would result, making the cost probably from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

In answer to some remarks from the Opposition,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER recommended having the motion stand over until Monday, when the Government would be prepared to state their views on the subject.

REPORT OF RED RIVER EXPEDITION.

Mr. MACDONALD, of Glengarry, moved for the report of S. J. Dawson, Esq., on the Red River Expedition of 1870—Carried.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, in reply to Hon. Mr. Holton, said the Government had given notice to customs officials that the repeal of duties on coal, coke, flour, wheat, &c., should take effect on April 1.

INSOLVENT ACT.

Mr. GODIN moved the House in Committee on Bill No. 35—an Act to amend

the Insolvent Act of 1869, with which are combined the provisions of the Bill No. 20 an Act to amend Section 2 of the Insolvent Act of 1869, as amended by the Select Committee.

Mr. MAGILL in the chair, the Bill was reported with an amendment, read a third time and passed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) withdrew his Bill to annex the Village of Seaforth to the South Riding of the County of Huron, on receiving the assurance of the Government that no election would take place before the re-adjustment of constituencies resulting from the census.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following private and local Bills were read a second and third time and passed :

An Act to incorporate the isolated Risk Fire Insurance Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

An Act to incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) resumed the debate on the Bill to admit British Columbia into the Dominion. He moved that the following words be inserted after the word "purpose" in the amendment: "The proposed engagement respecting the said Pacific Railway would in the opinion of this House press too heavily on the resources of the Dominion." He argued that the Government might well hesitate to enter into such engagements after the fears and doubts expressed by the hon. member for Sherbrooke and other fathers of the Confederation. But, the Government would do well to hesitate if they desired to consummate the Union. There were other colonies to be added to the Dominion. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island had yet to be brought in and it was not likely that they could be induced to join the Confederation under less advantageous terms than were now offered to the Pacific Colony. Hon. members opposite argued that if the Dominion was not immediately extended to the Pacific, the Western colony would be absorbed into the American Union, but the hon. members were adopting the very measures which would promote that movement. The strongest argument against annexation had always been that our taxes were light, that while the Americans had a debt amounting to \$60 per head, ours was not

quite \$27 per head of our population. Let these engagements be entered into by the Dominion, which were now before the House, and the result would be to leave us with a heavier debt in proportion to our resources than at present weigh down the American Union. The cause of our prosperity hitherto, had been the contrast between the United States and the Dominion, but the Government proposed to reverse the present position of the two countries. While the Americans were paying off their debt and reducing their taxes, Canada was about to incur liabilities too great for her to bear. He referred to the immense charge which the construction of the Pacific railway would bring on the country. He asked the House to take a business view of this engagement, and ask themselves should the Dominion undertake it (hear, hear). This extravagant proposal was the natural sequence of the Finance Minister's budget speech in which that hon. member had spoken of the advantages of a great national debt, and quoted from Macaulay in support of his view.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he had not advocated the creation of a national debt, nor had he quoted from Macaulay in support of such a view. He had merely quoted the passage referred to, to show how the great resources of England had enabled her to surmount the difficulties of a great national debt. (Applause.)

Mr. JONES—Then why refer to it at all. If the Hon. Finance Minister had no intention to foreshadow the creation of a great debt, why quote the passage? There was no doubt that the honourable gentleman had that end in view, and the House should unite in opposing such a suicidal policy.

Mr. BODWELL, in seconding the amendment of the honourable member for Halifax, spoke at considerable length against incurring the heavy liabilities which the construction of a Pacific railway would cause. He denied that there was any danger that British Columbia would be annexed to the United States if it were not brought into the Confederation. Did honourable members opposite suppose that Great Britain would allow the Republic to absorb any portion of Her Majesty's possessions without a struggle? If the cause was so weak that the Government were obliged to resort to such an argument in order to coerce their followers into voting for this measure, it would be better to drop it altogether. He quoted from the speech of the honourable member for Brome in the report of the Confederation debate to show how some of the advocates

Mr. Godin.

of this measure had once been most bitterly opposed to Confederation.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said it was most surprising, in looking back on the past history of Canada, to see what great things had been accomplished. The Government had been taunted time after time with not being sincere in the great work of building up a British power on this Continent, but they could turn to their record, and challenge their opponents on the other side of the House, by what they had really done. Was it nothing that the Dominion already stretched from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains! And now the question was whether they should or whether they should not make what had once been considered a dream a living reality, by doing their utmost to weld the Provinces from one ocean to the other into one solid Dominion. He was surprised at the course taken by some hon. gentlemen in the present debate, and especially at that taken by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, who had formerly taken the deepest interest in the question, and had spoken most earnestly in favour of the union now proposed; and he was more than surprised at the course of the hon. member for Lambton, who, though a later convert to the benefits of Confederation, had, with his party, stated that he should set himself to assist to establish and consummate the work. But who now, after speaking so often of his zeal for union, placed on record a motion which, while admitting the Pacific Railway to be an "urgent political necessity," attempted to prevent the House from entering on the discussion of, and adopting the proposed terms of union. The member for Sherbrooke had dealt with the matter on a broader basis than had more recently been introduced into the debate, and, while admitting that he had no quarrel with the amount of subsidy to be granted to British Columbia, stated that he would have preferred the terms originally proposed by British Columbia to those now proposed by the Government. He was sure, however, that that preference would not be shared by the House or the country. The original terms had provided the building of a coach road within three years of union, and that the railway also should be built as early as possible, with a specified expenditure of a million a year. The member for Lambton stated that he had never contemplated anything more than a road from Lake Superior, but of what benefit would such a road as that be. He also told the House that he was opposed to locking up the lands of the country by handing them over to a company, but he (Mr. Morris) maintained that the course being pursued by that hon. gentleman would lock up the

lands for ever. How could the lands be available for settlement and cultivation unless facility of access was provided? The Illinois road, which had been used by the hon. gentleman as an illustration of the danger of locking up lands by handing them over to a Company, was a proof that the very reverse was the case, for the results of that road were that Illinois was peopled rapidly, and the lands, instead of being locked up, were almost entirely disposed of, for out of a grant of two and a half millions of acres, only half a million remained in the hands of the Company. He asked the House seriously the nature and character of the land proposed to be acquired. That land consisted of the United Province of British Columbia and Vancouver's Island, and no one, who understood the matter, could deny that the addition of that Province would increase enormously the wealth, the resources, and the prosperity of the Dominion. He had several extracts from works on the country, showing its valuable nature and character, and thought the member for Lambton was not justified in the remarks he had used to the effect of there being scarcely any arable land in the whole of British Columbia.

Mr. MACKENZIE stated that what he had said was that after descending the slopes of the Rocky Mountains, the country was the roughest on the continent.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS thought the construction he had put on the hon. member's remarks was not very far wrong, but he could state on the undisputable authority of Mr. Trutch, the Surveyor General of British Columbia, that taking the whole of British Columbia and Vancouver's Island fully one third, or about 50,000,000 of acres was good farming land, while the whole acreage of Ontario was 77,000,000 acres. It appeared to him that throughout the whole debate a strange fallacy had existed. The Railway had been spoken of as a mere bargain to induce British Columbia to enter the Union, whereas that work was of more importance to Canada than it was to British Columbia, for, having already acquired the great North West they were compelled by force of circumstances to go forward and render it a valuable acquisition, and he was convinced that if the House turned its back on British Columbia by adopting the amendment of the member for Lambton, it would do a grievous injury to the cause of Confederation which might prove irreparable. The present position of Canada was analogous to that of the States some years ago, when that country, recognizing the importance and necessity of communication from one side

of its territory to the other, both as a bond of union between the people of the east and west, and as a means of securing the vast trade between Europe and Asia, had taken steps which in a short time would result in three different lines from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the reasons that had urged America should be equally powerful with Canada, and he believed the Canadian line could be constructed in a satisfactory manner, by means of the proposed land grant without in the least degree overburdening the people. The House in the course of the debate, had rung with cries that a debt of a hundred million dollars was being incurred, but the speakers knew well that by means of the land, the line could be constructed without any approach to a burden that the people could not bear, and no Ministry would ever dare to propose to incur such a debt as had been spoken of in this case. The Northern Pacific was being constructed on a land grant only, and could it be doubted therefore, that Canada, with better lands and fewer difficulties, would be able to devise such a scheme as would attract foreign capital, as the Americans had done. The House must be aware that before a dollar could be expended on an acre of land granted, a scheme would have to be submitted to and endorsed by the House, and therefore the whole matter would be within the control of Parliament. The question was whether or not British Columbia should be invited to join the Union, and whether or not the railway should be constructed, and he believed that when the Union should be accomplished and representatives from British Columbia should sit in that House, there would be no doubt of the railway being proceeded with as rapidly as the resources of the country would admit. He had every confidence not only that the House would endorse the proposition of the Government, but that it would be approved by the people of the country also, and it would be a bright day for the Dominion when the first sod was cut on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in time to come many of his friends opposite, who were really desirous of consummating Confederation, though they might now oppose this scheme, would rejoice that the Government had not been deterred from following out the work, but had persevered in their determination to carry forward the work of union with the Pacific colonies. (The hon. gentleman took his seat amid much cheering).

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT would not again have spoken but for the allusions made to him, but under the circumstances he felt bound to express his views on the important question before the House. Referring

Hon. Mr. Morris.

to the remarks of the Minister of Inland Revenue he (Sir A. T. Galt) considered that the course he was pursuing would tend much more to build up Confederation on a sound basis than that pursued by the Government, and that a policy of prudence and foresight was more necessary for the future progress of the Dominion than the unwise incurring of the obligations now proposed could possibly be. They should not lose sight of the real interests of the country in rushing forward in the path, which, though all might desire to follow it ultimately, if too hastily followed would defeat the very object desired to be obtained. As to the coach road proposed by British Columbia, involving a useless expenditure of money, he maintained that the necessities of the railway would require the construction of such a road so that it would have to be made in any case. As to the railway, the people of British Columbia had only asked for an expenditure of a million yearly, and even if that were continued in perpetuity it could not represent more than twenty millions. Those people had never presumed to demand that the line should be completed within a given time, and the proof that they had not done so had been shown by the Minister of Inland Revenue himself, who had argued that it was Canada that wanted the railway and not British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS stated that what he had said was that, throughout the discussion, the matter of the railway had been deliberately treated as if the whole benefits were to accrue to British Columbia, whereas Canada also had an equal interest in the work.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said he could not admit the statement that if the Government's resolutions were carried, Parliament would still retain the control of the matter. The details of the measure might come before them, but the obligation would remain that the work must be carried through *coute qui coute*. Five years ago, it had been decided that the Intercolonial Railway could not be undertaken without an Imperial guarantee; five years ago, the Province of Canada had to take a portion of the circulation of the country to meet her floating debt; two years ago, the Government had to borrow \$2,500,000 from the Bank of Montreal, to enable them to say that the money borrowed for the Intercolonial was still within their control, and only one year ago, the Finance Minister had to ask an increase of five per cent. on all duties to provide against a possible deficiency of revenue, but yet, when it now fortunately happened that we had a surplus, it seemed to be believed that this state of things must continue, and that it

was safe to incur any amount of obligation. He thought the people of British Columbia, if they really desired union, would be quite satisfied that the Dominion would construct a railway as rapidly as her resources would admit, and would not ask for any more. He hoped and believed the House would confirm the amendment of the member for Lambton.

It being six o'clock, the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. OLIVER resumed the debate arguing that the Pacific colony should be admitted into the Union on the same terms as the other Provinces. It was manifestly unfair to give \$100,000 per year for lands which had not yet been proved to be worth anything. The assumption of these lands by the Dominion, would entail additional expense on the general Government. It would be much better to leave them in the hands of the local Government who could manage them better than the Administration at Ottawa. He was opposed to giving large grants of land to any Company. If the free grant system were to be followed in settling the North West, it would never do to give the best of the land to a Railway Company. He would support the amendment.

Mr. MAGILL was in favor of bringing all British North America into the Union, but on terms equitable and fair to all the Provinces. The terms proposed by the Government were not of that nature, and if the measure were carried, it would have the effect of driving immigration from our shores. It was proposed to sap the very foundations of the constitution which had been framed with such care and at such a cost. It was too much to expect this colony with its 13,000 of a population to override our constitution and create dissensions in this Dominion with its four millions of people. He protested against the position in which the Government had placed the House by bringing down this measure, framed by themselves, without having had the opinion of this House or of the people of this Dominion on the subject, and said that it should not be altered in any degree. It was unfair, and he, for one, should record his vote against it (hear, hear).

Mr. COLBY believed that the hon. member for Lambton expressed the opinion of the whole country when he said that it was desirable to bring British Columbia into the Union, that it was expedient to prosecute the construction of the Pacific Railway and to commence and push it through as soon as the financial condition of the country would permit it. That was exactly the policy announced by the

Government. They brought down no cast-iron treaty. No one supposed that if they failed to complete the railway within the ten years they would be guilty of a breach of faith. They proposed to do their best to complete it within that period (cheers). All the opposition which had been offered to this measure now before the House, had been presented in exactly the same manner as the opponents to Confederation had fought against the Union in the past. He would not be surprised if the people of British Columbia should fail to obtain this union with Canada, if they looked to the United States for the introduction of capital to open up their country (cheers).

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said this was a matter of too great importance to be made a party question. He hoped every member would look upon it in a purely practical light, and oppose it as a Utopian measure brought in by the visionaries who were hurrying the country to ruin (ironical cheers). Looking at the measure on its merits there was something objectionable in every one of the clauses. He disapproved of the unfair Parliamentary representation, giving six members to 13,000 people; to pensioning officers, and to the payment of \$100,000 per annum to sustain a corrupt and extravagant Government, given, too, under the pretence that it was rent for public lands. Let the House know all the meaning of these terms. The Government of the Dominion were to undertake the construction and completion, under any contingency, of a Pacific railway within ten years after the date of the union. Why could not the Government come forward honestly and frankly and tell the truth, that they knew it would lay a heavy burden on the Dominion to carry out this engagement? But no, each member of the Government tried to make light of the difficulties to be encountered in the construction of this road. The Red River expedition, in their march to Fort Garry, had given evidence as to the nature of the country between the head of Lake Superior and Red River, and they had proved it to be of the most sterile character. It was proved to be, for hundreds of miles, a wilder ness of rock, swamp and lake, quite uninhabitable, and presenting the greatest difficulties to the construction of a railway. At the Rocky Mountains, fresh difficulties were to be met, and the *British Colonist*, a paper published at Victoria, V.I., favorable to Confederation, spoke of the route through which it was proposed to run the railway, as a "sea of mountains." If this account were correct, it would be difficult to find those vast tracts of fertile country

spoken of by hon. members opposite, and it could be no easy matter to run a railway through it. With this much known, this House should be enabled to understand how much of a burden they were expected to bear, before they were asked to vote for this measure. He spoke of the resources of the United States as very superior to those of Canada.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—We have more in proportion than they have. You may defend the American system, we are opposed to it.

Mr. ANGLIN said that the proposed debt would take away Canada's only advantage over the States, and the policy of the Government was breaking down all barriers and would ultimately tend to annexation. He condemned the proposed expenditure as enormous, and pointed out how a proposition to incur an amount in England equal, in proportion to her wealth, would be received, and said it could not be supposed that the amount could be paid without a greatly increased taxation. He spoke of the present surplus revenue as very exceptional, and spoke of the difficulties and deficiencies of former years, and said that the Minister of Finance himself understood that in the proposals now before the House, a debt of \$100,000,000 was incurred, under which the Dominion would stagger. In addition to this amount for cost of construction there would be the working expenses to add to the burden, and the result would be as described the previous night by the member for Wentworth. Where was the amount to be obtained? It could not be obtained, and the obligation was only to be incurred because some few thousands of people on the Pacific coast were discontented and would otherwise seek annexation to the United States. The statement that the cost incurred would only amount to a million and a quarter, could not be believed by a single member of the House. They would pledge themselves to construct the line in ten years, and who could say that the country would not have to pay every dollar. A company had been spoken of, but where was the company? How could any company raise seventy-five millions of dollars on fifty million acres of barren waste land, and the Government only played with the House and imposed on the credulity of their supporters in saying the work would be done by a railway. The question should be viewed calmly and dispassionately and not as a party question, as the Minister of Militia had tried to make it. The Minister of Customs had imagined a teeming and prosperous population in British Columbia and

the North West, but were they to base their vote on baseless imaginings. Where was this population to come from? When it was well known that the population of British Columbia had materially decreased of late years! It could only be explained by the fact that the country was not inviting to settlers. It was hard to persuade settlers to come even to Ontario and the other parts of the Dominion, and how could it be supposed that a larger immigration could be directed to these new colonies. The House had been told that it was bound to construct the railway to the Rocky Mountains, but he would like to know how, when and where that obligation was incurred;—they were bound to do nothing of the kind unless the finances of the country fully justified it. It had also been stated that although they incurred the obligation, they would not be compelled to carry it out unless they chose.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he had stated that the House was not to be led away, but was to remember that any scheme for carrying out the work would have to be submitted to it, and that it would control the whole matter, and those were the facts.

Mr. ANGLIN resumed that if the representative of British Columbia honestly considered the interests of his people he would repudiate the whole Government scheme. Let not the members believe the statement of any Minister, but let them read the words of the Resolutions themselves, and judge what a burden they involved, and he believed that if every duty and tax was doubled the expenditure could not be met, but when the debt and taxation was then increased the way to annexation would well be opened, and he stood there to do what he could to save the country from that fate, and from the irresistible ruin that would ensue from this scheme. He implored the House to ignore party and think of the country.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS had been anxious before speaking to hear the views of others. He had listened with great attention to the gentleman who had preceded him, and there could only be one opinion that the whole tone of his remarks showed opposition to the acquisition to British Columbia, and opposition to the construction of a railway, and the coalition that had taken place on the opposite side showed only opposition to the cause of union with the Pacific colonies. He would ask members on both sides to consider the position of the Government, and he assumed they were all in favor of Confederation. He desired to call particular attention to the fact that all proceedings were of the character of negotiations between two par-

Hon. Mr. Anglin.

ties, as to the best means of accomplishing an object on which both were agreed. The Government entered into the negotiations, and with one or two exceptions the whole House seemed in favor of Union with British Columbia and of the construction of the railway. He was surprised, however, to hear the member for Gloucester cheered by the gentleman round him when speaking of ignoring the whole population except the whites. The remainder of the population contributed most largely to the revenue, and he could speak from experience that the Chinese were an exceedingly valuable class as a duty paying people. The objections of hon. gentlemen had dwindled down entirely to the matter of the railroad. The proposition made, was that the railway was an absolute necessity, and that Canada should use every exertion to construct it at as early a date as possible. In the negotiations that took place, it was found impossible that Canada could undertake to commence this railway and make a stated payment annually, and it had never been understood that the Government themselves should undertake the work, but that it should be done by means of Companies with a land grant and money grant. Every calculation had been based on that understanding.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Give us the calculations.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS—It was not necessary to give minute details, and he had already given a rough estimate based on statements of the most eminent engineers. Hon. gentlemen had admitted the necessity of the railway, but that had not been the tone of the member for Gloucester. His views were widely different from those of the representatives of Ontario. During the course of the discussion, he could not help thinking of the important proceedings at Washington, and thinking of those and of the important negotiations with the delegates from British Columbia, he was surprised at the cavilling on small matters which had taken place. The member for Gloucester seemed entirely opposed to the railway, but that was not the view of the member for Sherbrooke, who was well known as a promoter of such a railway, and a believer in its practicability. The Government scheme was a modification of the propositions of British Columbia, and although they would not undertake a stated annual expenditure, they fully admitted the necessity of the construction of the railway.

Mr. SCATCHERD asked whether if the land would not build the road, the road would not be built.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said no, he had already stated that it was estimated that the Dominion would have to pay about a million and a quarter a year, but it was well understood that if insurmountable difficulties arose, the Government could not be supposed to proceed to anything ruinous. But it was necessary to satisfy British Columbia that Canada was in earnest in going on with the work, and therefore a time was specified. No one had answered the argument that the railway was not entirely a bargain with British Columbia, for if that colony had not consented to join the Union, would not a railway to the Rocky Mountains still have been a necessity. The negotiations had necessarily to assume the shape of a Treaty, and in all such matters concessions had to be made on both sides. The delegates themselves had been of different opinions, and the result of the conferences that had taken place, was embodied in the resolutions before the House, and no amendments could be made without throwing open the whole question. These were questions on which the people of British Columbia dissented from the terms now settled, and any amendment would reopen the whole matter. The matter must be dealt with and accepted or rejected as a whole. Very many more forebodings had been expressed as to the financial result of the propositions. The debt of Canada was about \$20 a head and that of America \$60 a head, and yet they could undertake three different lines of road, and he did not think Canada need have any fear on the matter. As to the debt of \$100,000,000 Government had no intention of incurring anything of the sort. Of course the Government undertook the work in ten years, but if after doing everything to carry out the engagement in good faith, it should be found that untoward circumstances should prevent the completion of the work, could it be supposed that Canada would be required to proceed to her own serious disadvantage, even if the work might be delayed for some years. He referred to the strictures of the member for Wentworth as to the Municipal Loan Fund, and shewed that the measure he had proposed had been most generally supported, and yet he was charged individually with the whole matter. All that had been done however, was to enable municipalities to borrow money in their own discretion. He spoke of what the member for South Oxford had said, as to his departure from, and return to Canada, explaining the circumstances that had led to his doing so, denying all charge of inconsistency. He then continued, they had either to spurn or accept British Columbia, and the result of the

amendment, if carried, would be to do away with all hope of bringing British Columbia into the Union.

Mr. WORKMAN (Montreal) deprecated any party feelings in the discussion, the question being one of the utmost importance to the future of the country. He regretted very much that he would have to dissent from the Government scheme, which appeared calculated to damage the country. He was friendly to the completion of Confederation, notwithstanding. It was his opinion that this railroad would involve Canada in an expenditure of at least fifty millions. The cost of this work, the great difficulties natural and others in its way were reasons for our carefully considering this scheme and its consequences before rashly embarking in it. He ridiculed the spread-eagle anticipations and flourishes indulged in respecting this railway, and particularly the notion that the trade of China and Japan could be attracted over North America by this trans-continental road. Any merchant or intelligent man knew that the products of the East would be damaged by railway carriage, and that the shipping presented the best means of transportation. It was all nonsense to attribute to Confederation the credit for the present prosperity of the country (hear, hear). As to the expectations connected with the Intercolonial, he believed from reliable information that it would be a source of expense, trouble and anxiety to us. But at any rate let us see how it worked before entering upon another and longer railway. It was bad enough to have one elephant on our shoulders without a second (laughter and cheers). In the name of his constituents and of the trade and commerce of the country he protested against this scheme, which made him tremble for it; and it was because he thought it would be ruinous to the Dominion that he would vote against these resolutions (cheers).

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that although the debate had extended over three days there were two or three points to which no reference had yet been made, to which he felt it his duty to draw attention. He believed that a very large majority of the members of this House were desirous of seeing British Columbia united to the Dominion. Some twenty years ago, when he first entered into public life as a journalist, he had placed on his political platform as one of its most prominent planks Union of the British North American Provinces. In 1859 he was present at the Reform Convention in Toronto when the political condition of the country was discussed, and on that occasion he moved a

resolution which embodied the principle on which this great scheme was founded. It received the assent of a majority of that assembly, and ever since then he had been endeavouring to the best of his ability to promote and advance this great measure. Along with hon. members opposite, it had been his good fortune to help to push forward Confederation, and he now accused them of having failed in the performance of their duty in the final accomplishment of the work. He said so boldly, looking at it from no political or party stand point, and feeling no desire, as might be the case with some hon. members of the Opposition, to see the Government displaced from their seats at the present moment if they would only do their duty. Taking an impartial view of the case, he must charge them with having struck a fatal blow at the great measure with which for the last few years they had been connected, and for the success of which they were pledged to this House and responsible to the country. They propose, in order to induce, as they alleged, British Columbia to enter the Union, to load the Dominion with a debt double that under which the country now suffered, under which, at all events, it now labored. For the purpose of accomplishing this Union, no such sacrifice, no such burden, no such evil consequences were at all necessary. He failed to hear any decent reason why this Government should, without the authority of Parliament and without submitting the proposition in any form for public discussion, spring it on the House as they had done. Under the constitution, no such authority was delegated to the Government. No authority was given them, of their own motion, to enter into, and finally conclude, negotiations which, as the House was told, must be accepted without qualification or amendment.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY—What did you do at the Quebec conference?

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL had expected to hear this question asked, but he would tell the hon. member that this was an entirely different case. The Quebec conference was a body of gentlemen assembled together to discuss the propriety of passing the law which regulated this very matter. The terms of that law were publicly discussed in the Press and in the various existing legislative bodies of the several Provinces. It was agreed to by them, and alterations were made in accordance with expressions of opinion at the very last moment in England to meet the difficulties developed by these discussions. These circumstances were altogether different from those which surround the present case. In the Union Act were the

Mr. Scatcherd.

ipsissima verba which show how the Union of the other colonies is to be consummated. The Constitutional Act points out the parties who are to negotiate. It declares that the members of this House are one body, and the members of the other House another body, who are to settle its terms.

Hon. Sir GEO. CARTIER said the proper way to bring in the colony was through the Government of the day. It involved a pecuniary expenditure, and could not emanate from any other source.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the proposition which had been under debate for the last three days was not subject to the ordinary rule. The Government had taken every precaution to tell the House that this measure was in the nature of a treaty, that not one of its details could be altered, and that it must be accepted as it was submitted to the House. Now, the meaning of the constitution was very different. It was only after full consideration in this Parliament that the measure should be accepted. Of what use was this debate at all, if the measure must be adopted without amendment [cheers]. He would remind the House, that British Columbia was a Crown colony, with a population principally of miners and adventurers, and a very small number of permanent settlers. It was so at the time of Confederation, possibly the population was larger then. There was no popular representation at that time. This position did not fail to strike the attention of the Conference. It was the policy of the Imperial Government, and the four Provinces to complete the Union of all British America as soon as possible. He with others at the Conference had contended that it was the duty of the Imperial Government to bring pressure to bear on its own officers of British Columbia to submit to reasonable terms in order to secure Union with Canada. The small number of the inhabitants did not justify the admission of a colony on more favourable terms than those offered to the older and more populous Atlantic Provinces. The circumstances were entirely different and it was absurd to say that the future destiny of that country was in the hands of a few adventurers who were mining there. Since Confederation was agreed upon, the Imperial Government has put it out of their power to use that effective influence they might have used to secure proper terms and compel their acceptance by the Government and people of that colony. He did not believe there was any desire on the part of the majority of the people of British Columbia to make demands unreasonable or impracticable. What right

had they in discussing terms with Canada to stipulate for construction of public works inside their own territory in the North West territories or in Ontario? He did not believe the people of that Colony ever expected that privilege or would have insisted on this railway on the present conditions. The railway would have three sections, differing as to character of country, quality of the land and other features. We know that no person would settle along the Ontario end of the line stretching to a distance of a thousand miles between the Ottawa valley and the Lake of the Woods, for it presented no agricultural or trading advantages to attract settlers. The middle sections consisted of good land, but had too sparse a population to afford a business for a railway for many years to come. Through and beyond the Rocky Mountains the country was of a nature most difficult for a railway and most discouraging as regards the prospects of settlement and traffic. It was absurd and unreasonable then for us to rush into a vast expenditure for a work of this kind without accurate knowledge of the country, without surveys, without any means of enabling us to form a reliable estimate as to its cost. Did the Government, then, in the absence of any knowledge, that capitalists would undertake this road, contemplate the construction of the line themselves? Or did they really intend to delay the completion of the road if serious difficulties arose, notwithstanding the pledge and promise now offered British Columbia? If that was the intention of the Government, why not say so frankly and honestly? All, he thought, that should be promised or undertaken at present was the construction of a telegraph and coach road, or at the utmost, of a railway from Pembina to the Rocky Mountains. In a short time the American road from the borders of Ontario to Pembina would be completed, and be as accessible and serviceable to our people as to themselves. Besides the Government of Canada would shortly establish a mixed land and water communication from Lake Superior to Fort Garry, which would provide all the facilities we needed for the present, perhaps for years. He saw no difficulty, whatever, in making use of the American road to reach Fort Garry and the Rocky Mountains. By giving liberal land grants to a company, and retaining alternate sections of land we might secure a railway across the plains and promote the rapid settlement of the fertile belt. Beyond that a good serviceable post road could be opened to the Pacific coast, realizing all the people of that colony some short time ago solicited, and accomplishing all the trade and interest of the Dominion, generally,

required. He was as anxious as any man to see this Confederation completed; but denied he was therefore bound to accept every absurd, extravagant scheme proposed professedly with that object, and not shown to be either necessary or practicable. Was he to be blamed for hesitating to agree to every wild proposition of this kind? If we assented to this proposition we should weigh down the Dominion to a position which would not only excite dissatisfaction among her own inhabitants, but destroy all confidence in our future among the people of other nations (cheers). With respect to the political arrangements he considered that the representatives for so small a number of people was a violation of the principles laid down in the Union Act, but the evil would be cured in a few years so that the matter was not of serious consequence. The Manitoba measure had been passed under peculiar circumstances and was no precedent to sanction the present violation of the fundamental principles of the constitution, but, as he had said, the evil would be temporary, and might be conceded to British Columbia. The same might be said of the money grant, which, though based on a larger population than really existed, did not form a serious objection, for it had always been understood that the small Provinces should be enabled to carry on their Government and local works and he would be quite ready to vote directly a sufficient sum to enable British Columbia to meet her expenses. While, however, the matter of the railway stood on its present basis he had no hesitation in opposing the Government scheme, although he yielded to no one in his desire to complete Confederation. He was astonished that Government should have attempted to impose the condition that no alteration should be made, for the Act of Union gave to the two Houses of Parliament and to no other body the right to make any amendment they might deem expedient, and while the Legislative Council of British Columbia had discussed every detail of the scheme, he contended that the same right belonged to the people and Parliament of this Dominion (cheers).

Mr. BEATY had received no intimation from his constituents to oppose the Government scheme, and he believed the general impression in Ontario was that Confederation could not be completed without British Columbia. He had every confidence in the Ministry both in legislating for the present and future, and he believed the interests of the country would be well cared for by them. In the matter of Manitoba the people of Ontario had been warned against the narrow minded

Frenchmen, but he maintained that for every liberty they possessed, civil and religious, they were mainly indebted to the representatives of Lower Canada. If the present scheme carried and the railway was constructed successfully, as he believed it would be, the honor would belong to the Minister of Militia and his noble band of reformers. The matter had been fully discussed, and what was the policy—well, his idea was that the policy was whether the gentlemen of the Opposition should be allowed to sit on the Government benches. That was their policy, and they did not care whether the North West was developed or not. The Government now proposed, however, a scheme of opening up the country and numbers of immigrants would come in, instead of leaving for the States as at present, and before many years elapsed, thousands of immigrants would be attracted if the Government were allowed to carry out their plans of development. He looked forward to a great future for Canada on these grounds, and having every confidence in the resolutions he should support them, and if he did otherwise he would think he had degraded himself. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. DORION said the question had two aspects, the political and the financial, the latter, however, was much the most important and he had listened to the Government statements on that head in hope of being able to vote for the resolutions, but the Minister of Finance had been able to give no favorable statement. He took great care not to give any details, and beyond the assertion that a cost of \$100,000,000 would be practicable, they had heard nothing. The American lines had been cited as examples but it had not been stated that in addition to the land grants an enormous amount of money had also been granted. The Minister of Finance ought to be able to state definitely the amount involved so that the House might not have to make a blind vote, and he regretted the humiliating proposal of the Minister of Inland Revenue, that after the pledge had been given it might afterwards be retracted. He spoke of the heavy obligations the Dominion already sustained, and maintained that the Union Act provided that the canal system ought to have been completed before any other responsibilities were incurred.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY read the resolution at Quebec to show that the North West question was to be an express object of Confederation.

Hon. Mr. DORION said that matter had already been attained. He had never had, and had not now, any faith in Confederation, but he had felt in duty

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

bound not to oppose it, but if he were most anxious for the downfall of Confederation, he could desire for nothing more than the present scheme to attain that object. Reverting to the Canal improvement, he considered it unjust that the credit of the country should be pledged to this immense extent before that canal improvement was completed. He quoted from a report of Mr. Fleming, characterising the Pacific Railway as a commercial absurdity and that the maintenance of such a line would cost eight millions annually, and in fact that it was altogether impracticable, and stating that a macadamized road to the Rocky Mountains would require seventeen years for construction, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite presumed to say that this gigantic work could be commenced and completed within ten years. What greater absurdity could be uttered in any intelligent Assembly? If Confederation must be had in some direction better have it with the 150,000 of Newfoundland and the 100,000 of Prince Edward's Island than with the 10,000 of British Columbia, while the inhabitants in one case were settled, and in the other mere roving adventurers. He did not admit the necessity of a Canadian Pacific line, but thought the American lines should be used, and expend the money rather in opening up the North West by roads. He thought the four millions of people inhabiting the basin of the St. Lawrence were entitled to greater consideration than the small population of British Columbia, and if this large expenditure were to be incurred rather let it be used in enlarging the canals and so securing the great trade of the West.

The members were called in at one o'clock and the amendment of Mr. Jones, of Halifax, was put with the following result: Yeas, 63; Nays, 98.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Cimon, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones, (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, Killam, Macdonald [Glengarry], Macfarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Renfrew), McMonies, Metcalf, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith, [Westmoreland], Snider, Stinton, Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White (Holton), Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.] and Young—63.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bewell, Bown, Burton, Campbell, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hagar, Heath, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holmes,

Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McCallum, McConkey, McDougall (Three Rivers), McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ryan, (Montreal West), Savary, Scrivier, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Thompson (Haldimand), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [East Hastings], Wilson, and Wright (Ottawa County)—98.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas) had ever been desirous of uniting the Provinces into one compact body, but the scheme was not perfected, and he thought the amendment he was about to move would open the way for a better settlement than that proposed in the resolutions before the House. He felt the country did not properly understand the question and thought every one should be able to communicate with his constituents. He proposed in amendment that, in the opinion of this House the further consideration of the question be postponed for the present session of Parliament in order that greater and more careful consideration may be given to a question of such magnitude and importance to the people of this Dominion.

The vote on this amendment was as follows: Yeas, 75; Nays, 85.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Cimon, Coffin, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones, (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, Killam, Little, Macdonald, [Glengarry], Mackenzie, Magill, McCallum, McConkey, McDougall, [Lanark], McDougall (Renfrew), McMonies, Metcalf, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Munroe, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith, [Westmoreland], Snider, Stinton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wallace, Webb, Wells, White (Halton), Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young—75.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bewell, Bown, Burton, Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Colby, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Hincks, (Sir Francis), Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald, (Lunenburg), McDonald, (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall, (Three Rivers), McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scrivier, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, White Wilson and Wright (Ottawa County)—85.

Mr. MACKENZIE'S amendment was put with the following result Yeas, 67; Nays, 94.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron [Huron], Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Geoffrin, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Kempt, Killam, Macdonald [Glen-garry], McFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison, [Victoria O.], Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Redford, Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—67.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Chauveau, Coffin, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McCallum, McDougall [Three Rivers], McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Dundas], Ryan [Montreal West], Savary, Scrivier, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [East Hastings], Wilson and Wright [Ottawa County].—94.

On the main motion being put,

Hon. Mr. DORION moved in amendment that the speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved that, in view of the engagements already entered into since the Confederation and the large expenditure urgently required for canal and railway purposes within the Dominion, this House would not be justified in imposing on the people of this Dominion the enormous burden required to build within ten years a railway to the Pacific as proposed by the resolution submitted to this House. The amendment was lost on the following division: Yeas, 70; Nays, 91.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron [Huron], Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alex. T.], Geoffrin, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Kempt, Killam, Macdonald [Glen-garry], McFarlane, McKenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison [Victoria O.], Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright, [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—70.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir Geo. E.], Cayley, Chauveau, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Da-

oust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McCallum, McDougall [Three Rivers], McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Dundas], Ryan [Montreal West], Savary, Scrivier, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [East Hastings], Wilson, and Wright [Ottawa County].—91.

The main motion was again put and carried.

YEAS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier, Cayley, Chauveau, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McCallum, McDougall [Three Rivers], McGreevy, McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Dundas], Ryan [Montreal West], Savary, Scrivier, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [East Hastings], Wilson and Wright [Ottawa County].—91.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron [Huron], Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Cimon, Coffin, Colby, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Godin, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Kempt, Killam, Macdonald [Glen-garry], McFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison, [Victoria O.], Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith, Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—71.

Mr. MACKENZIE gave notice that he would move other amendments in Committee.

Mr. ANGLIN said the Government had not had a clear majority of the total members of the House.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said that had all been present, the Government majority would have been greater.

The main motion was carried and the House went into Committee on the resolutions, Mr. COLBY in the Chair. The resolutions passed through Committee and the Committee rose.

The House adjourned at 2 o'clock a.m.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, 31st March, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

THE BOUCHETTE MEMORIAL.

Hon. Mr. RYAN asked the indulgence of the House whilst he referred very briefly to the memorial of the descendants of the late Joseph Bouchette, who was in his life time the Surveyor-General of the late Province of Lower Canada, now Quebec. The grandfather and great-grandfather of the petitioners was a distinguished officer in the service in Canada during the war of Independence. This son was Joseph Bouchette, the Surveyor-General, who in the performance of his duties prepared a map which was well known to everyone who had studied the geography of this country. He prepared a very admirable work in reference to Canada, and submitted it during 1814 to the Legislature of the then Province of Quebec. A vote was passed in that Legislature for £1,500 to enable him to proceed to England to have the work properly engraved and published. He brought out a series of valuable maps, which cost him some £4,000 sterling. He would certainly never have undertaken the work had it not been the encouragement which he felt when the Legislature passed the vote in question, but as an illustration of the uncertainty of legislation sometimes, he was only paid £500 out of the £1,500, though it was acknowledged that he had fully fulfilled his obligation. Mr. Bouchette, unable to get reimbursed, was obliged to sell a valuable Seignory at a sacrifice, and his descendants had consequently sustained a positive injury in that respect. No one could doubt that the work in question was not simply of a Provincial, but really of a Dominion character. Under these circumstances the petitioners came before the House and asked that their case be taken into its favorable consideration.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN spoke warmly of the public services of the Surveyor General, who was well known in New Brunswick, and alluded to the high character of his works in reference to the topography and geography of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD also alluded to the services of the same gentleman in connection with the arrangement of a boundary line between New Brunswick and Canada. Both he (Mr. Botsford) and Colonel, then Major Robinson, had been much indebted to Mr. Bouchette for information which he was able to give them.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that the discussion was certainly irregular—he had a

petition sent him asking for certain compensation, but he did not feel at liberty to present it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he presumed the object of presenting the petition was to evoke an expression of opinion in its favour, and stated that he sympathized with the effort which was being made in the matter. He could not, of course, say how the matter was to be managed, but he trusted that some means would be found of doing so.

Hon. Mr. MILLER referred to the high character of the works of Col. Bouchette, which were of a Dominion character, and expressed his surprise that he had never been compensated for his great labour.

The matter then dropped.

MESSAGE.

A Message was received from the House of Commons with the following Bills:

To incorporate the Confederation Life Association.

To incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

To incorporate the Isolated Risk Fire Insurance Company.

To amend the Insolvent Act of 1869.

To prolong for a limited time the time allowed for the redemption of rents reserved on certain Indian lands in the Township of Dundee.

The second reading of the foregoing Bills was ordered for Monday next.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL submitted the report of the Committee respecting the Library of Parliament. Consideration on Monday next.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, reported favorably on petitions from the Marine Fire Insurance Company, the Sun Insurance Company of Montreal, and on the Bill respecting the corporation of Owen Sound.

On motion of Mr. McPHERSON, the Bill in reference to Owen Sound was ordered for the third reading on Monday.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON presented a report from the Joint Committee on Printing. Consideration on Monday next.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL gave notice that he would, on the following Monday, introduce resolutions with respect to the admission of British Columbia into the Union.

ENQUIRIES.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY asked the Government for information respecting the distribution of the Geological Reports.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS replied that copies had been sent to the Local Governments for distribution. The price of those sold to the general public was \$2.50 each.

Hon. Mr. BOURINOT asked if the report of Mr. Boyd with respect to False Bay Beach, Mire, C.B., had been received.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL could not reply at that moment.

MARINE.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL introduced a Bill respecting certain officers of the Trinity House, Quebec.

The Bill was read a first time—second reading on Monday next.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SANBORN the time limited for receiving Private Bills was extended to the 6th April.

MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU, on making the motion of which he had given notice some days previously, referred to the mode of legislation pursued in respect to the new Province of Manitoba. He was strongly of opinion that since the proclamation which admitted the Territory of Manitoba into the Confederation, the people of the province now enjoyed the powers of self-government in their entirety. But they had the right to touch in advance, the subsidy granted by the 24th and 25th sections of the Act of Manitoba, that is to say:

Interest on \$47,290.....	\$ 2,364 50
5 per cent. in addition.....	30,000 00
The 80 cents a head, according to population.....	13,400 00
	<hr/>
	\$45,764 50

Besides all the charges that are at the expenses of the Federal Government. The half of the foregoing sum, he contended, should be paid in advance every six months. It was absurd to expect, that with such an insufficient subsidy, they could meet all the expenses entailed upon them, by the action of the Federal Government. He must refer specially to the presence of the Volunteers as unjustifiable and an infringement of the constitutional rights of the people of the Province. He did not believe their presence was calculated to promote that kindly feeling which should

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

animate the people of Manitoba with respect to the Dominion. He was convinced that the course pursued by the Government of Canada, from the outset, had not been dictated by wisdom or prudence or a correct comprehension of the feelings and wishes of the people, who made up so large a portion of the population. He wished to see a different state of things in the future, and the Government of Manitoba no longer subject to the caprice of the Executive of Canada. He moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a summary of the expenses incurred and revenue received under the operation of the Act 32, and 33 *Victoria*, chapter 3, "*for the temporary government of Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory*" since those territories have been united to Canada under the provisions of *The British North America Act, 1867*," including all expenses incurred and revenue received to the close of this Session under the following heads:

1st. Expenses connected with the administration of justice in those territories, including the salaries and allowances of the Judges of the Superior Courts and of District and County Courts.

2nd. Expenses of transport and maintenance of a military force and of a police force, and other expenses of that kind.

3rd. Salaries or allowances of the Lieutenant-Governor and his Privy Council.

4th. Rents of houses or buildings occupied by the different public departments.

5th. Salaries of persons employed.

6th. Expenses incurred for postal services, in relation to customs, gaols, and the militia, and for the protection of the fisheries, and all expenses connected with the public service under the said temporary government.

7th. Amount of customs and excise duties and of revenue from all other sources collected during the same period.

8th. Summary of expenses incurred in opening communications with, establishing government in, and providing for settlement of the North West Territories, including expenditure to Red River, paid out of the sum of \$1,460,000 granted to Her Majesty for those purposes by the Act 33 *Victoria*, chap. 2, "*for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required to defray certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1870, and the 30th June, 1871.*"

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE seconded the motion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL differed entirely from the hon. gentleman, who made the motion, when he said that the volunteers were in Manitoba contrary to the wishes of the people.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU meant to say that since there was a regularly established Government in the new Province, we had no right to keep volunteers there—it was contrary to law.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the presence of the volunteers had certainly tended to preserve order, and that they were received and treated most kindly by the people among whom they were living. Rumours had been circulated to the prejudice of the volunteers, but they had been proved already to be without foundation. As respects the motion, he would endeavour to obtain the information asked for at as early a day as possible.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU did not expect to get the information immediately.

The motion then passed.

CURRENCY.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill to assimilate the currency of the Dominion. He stated, in explanation, that its object was to change the currency of Nova Scotia, and make it similar to that of the rest of the Dominion. The measure had been postponed for some time in the hope there would be a system of International Currency established, but the prospect of that now seemed very remote. He hoped that the change would be found beneficial in Nova Scotia, where there were several counties already favourable to it. Hitherto the Government had paid every attention to the appeals of Nova Scotia on the subject, but further delay would now, they felt, be an injustice to New Brunswick, and other parts of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said that he supposed the Bill might be regarded as the requiem of the old Halifax currency which had done good work in its day, and had been found eminently adapted to meet the wants and requirements of the business community. It had been characterized as the easiest and simplest currency for computation to be found anywhere. Formerly in Nova Scotia the Mexican dollar was received at 5s 2½d.—thus a fictitious value was given to coin, a very large number of which used to circulate. In 1860 the present Chief Justice of Nova Scotia [Sir William Young] introduced a Bill which brought the decimal system into operation; and being in the Legislative Council at that time, he [Mr. Dickey] had opposed the measure on the principle

that if a change were necessary, they should assimilate the currency to that of the other countries of the Continent. Instead of doing so, however, they established the present anomalous currency—we made it dollars and cents—a dollar which it took 103 cents to pay. He had been in favour of assimilation in 1860, and was so still. He had certainly wished to see the currency of the Dominion established on the basis of the Nova Scotia system, and had urged, in common with other representatives of the Province, that time should be given to see the results of the International Conference. Inasmuch as there was no prospect of any international system being arranged, they had no objection to the assimilation of the currency. As respects the Bill itself, he asked the Postmaster General why there was not a value given to the English silver. He also expressed the opinion that some loss might accrue to parties, in connection with the collection of debts, which are to be paid under the fourth section by equivalent sums in the currency of Canada,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that he understood that there was no value given to the English silver, because it was not considered desirable to encourage its circulation. Arrangements had been made with banks to retain all the silver which came into their possession.

Hon. Mr. RYAN was of the opinion that a uniform currency was very desirable, and he had no intention of opposing the Bill. He had only risen to correct an impression which seemed to prevail among those who took a deep interest in such questions, that there was no prospect of the establishment of an International Currency. Reading the debates which took place on the Bill elsewhere, he found the Minister of Customs was reported to have said that “the prospect of an international currency was so entirely done away with there could be no possible reason for further postponement.” Another member of the Cabinet, in the same discussion said, “the question had been staved off time and again in the hope of an international currency, but such a hope was now at an end.” Now he (Mr. Ryan) was desirous of knowing where those gentlemen got the information on which they based their very positive assertions. In this connection he asked the House to permit him to read the following extract from a gentleman (H. W. Chisholm) who was on the Commission for the establishment of international metric standards:—“The International Metric Commission met at Paris on 8th August, representatives from nearly all civilized countries, except the German States at war with France, being

present. It was the day after the news of McMahon's defeat reached Paris, and the deplorable state of things of course put a stop at once to our proceedings until a more favourable period. We met, however, every day for a week and discussed fully all preliminary matters, and inaugurated the Commission as successfully as could be hoped under the circumstances.

"I saw Mr. J. H. Smith, the day before yesterday; the question of International Coinage like that of International Metrie Standard, is quite in abeyance till after the restoration of peace in France. I do hope that there is now some prospect of terms being come to. When things are at their worst, they must mend."

In conclusion, Mr. RYAN stated that when at Washington the other day, a gentleman who had been one of the International duties to meet the Commissioners in Paris had also assured him that the prospect of satisfactorily arranging those matters was very bright if peace could be once established in Europe.

Hon. Mr. WARK said that the people of New Brunswick found their system of currency to work admirably, and went on to refer to the necessity of arranging some mode by which long standing debts can be settled, for instance a property mortgage not paid for a number of years. In respect to American gold coins, too, he thought that they should be defined at halves and quarters instead of the phraseology used in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that all those matters could be discussed in Committee, and in answer to the hon. member for Montreal, expressed the hope that the efforts for the establishment of an International coinage would result satisfactorily, but his own impression was that some time must pass away before the object desired could be attained.

The motion was carried.

Bill referred to Committee on Monday.

RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, the preamble of which states that the object is to construct "a railway from Toronto to Ottawa, passing through or near Peterboro', Madoc and Carleton Place, with power to cross the Ottawa River at or near Ottawa City, and to unite, amalgamate, or make running arrangements with railway lines in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the construction of such a railway would be of great public advantage, by affording facilities for the settlement of the back country, bringing to

Hon. Mr. Ryan.

market the productions thereof, and forming through the Capital of the Dominion, a most valuable line of communication for National Defence, and is a work for the general advantage of Canada." The hon. gentleman referred to the advantages that the railway would confer on the country through which it would run, and the valuable resources it would develop.

The Bill was read a second time, and referred to the Committee of Banking, Railways and Commerce.

THE FENIAN INVASION.

The House then went into Committee on the Bill respecting an indemnity to members of Government in connection with the Fenian invasion.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN in the chair

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without any amendment.

Third reading on Monday.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 31, 1871.

After routine.

CANAL COMMISSION.

Hon Mr. LANGEVIN, in reply to Mr. Mackenzie, said that the Government had closed the Canal Commission and would distribute the minority report.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

The Act to amend the Act relating to duties of customs, was passed through Committee, Mr. STREET in the chair.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE.

The amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 29, for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of revenue, were read a second time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the second reading of Bill No. 61, respecting weights and measures. He explained the objects of the Bill to be the defining of standards throughout the Dominion, and providing for a proper inspection of weights and measures.

After some further conversation the second reading was carried, to be referred to Committee to-morrow.

METRIC SYSTEM.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved the second reading of an Act to render permissive the use of the metric system of weights and measures.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON questioned the advantage of the Bill at all, if rendered permissive.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he was following the example of England and other countries, where the result of making the Bill permissive in the first instance, and so allowing the change to be brought about gradually, had been very beneficial.

Hon. Mr. Anglin was opposed to the Bill and hoped it would not pass further than the second reading.

Second reading carried.

DOMINION NOTES, &c.,

On motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, the Act to provide additional facilities for the deposit of savings at interest with the security of Government; and for the issue and redemption of Dominion notes was read a second time.

CRIMINAL LAWS.

On the motion of Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, the Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion (from Senate) was read a second time.

INSPECTION LAWS

On the motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the Act to amend and consolidate and to extend to the whole Dominion of Canada, the laws respecting the inspection of certain staple articles of Canadian produce was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee on Banking and Commerce.

EXCISE DUTIES IN MANITOBA.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. MORRIS the Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act of 1868 and to alter the duties of excise chargeable in the Province of Manitoba was read a second time.

INDIAN LANDS.

On the motion of Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER the Act to prolong for a limited time the term allowed for the redemption of rents reserved on certain Indian lands in the Township of Dundee was read a second and third time and passed.

PORT WARDEN AT QUEBEC.

On the motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS

HINCKS the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the appointment of a Port Warden at Quebec, Mr. MILLS in the Chair.

The resolutions passed through Committee, were read a second time, and a Bill was introduced and read a first time.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

On the motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider a Resolution declaring it to be expedient to amend the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 40, respecting the settlement of the affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada, Mr. MILLS in the Chair.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS explained that in winding up the affairs of the Bank the Government had found great difficulty in being unable to redeem outstanding notes and obligations of the Bank, and the object now desired to be attained was that the Government should be authorized to advance a sum not exceeding \$250,000 so as to clear off all outstanding notes and claims, and wind up the whole matter. The sum advanced would be amply secured by good mortgages bearing seven per cent interest.

The resolutions passed through the Committee and a Bill was introduced.

NORTH WEST LOAN.

On the motion of Sir FRANCIS HINCKS, the House went into Committee of the whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide, that the loan of one million four hundred and sixty thousand dollars, or three hundred thousand pounds sterling, raised in England, with the guarantee of the Imperial Government for the payment of the interest thereon, under the authority of the Act of Canada, 32 and 33 Vic., Cap. 1, for the purpose of paying a like sum to the Hudson's Bay Company, for the purposes set forth in the said Act,—be made the next charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, after any charge thereon created or to be created thereon, under the Act of Canada passed in the 31st year of Her Majesty's Reign, Chapter 41, for any loan for fortifications; and that further provision be made with respect to the loan first above mentioned in conformity to the requirements of the Act of the Imperial Parliament, 32 and 33 Vic. Cap. 101, under which the guarantee of the Imperial Government was given for the payment of the interest on the said loan, Mr. MILLS in the Chair. The Resolution passed through the Committee and a Bill was introduced.

FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. TUPPER the House went into Committee of the whole, Hon. Col. GREY in the Chair to consider a Resolution declaring it expedient to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels, passed in the thirty-first year of Her Majesty's Reign, &c.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the Government thought it expedient in consideration of the Commission now sitting at Washington, to pass a measure that might well be considered by the United States as needlessly aggressive, if not offensive. He thought the powers sought to be given to the Minister of Marine, as extraordinary and exceptional.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER was quite sure that every one must desire that the present negotiations at Washington might result in rendering the provisions now proposed unnecessary, but he thought that on examination the Bill would not be found open to the objection that had been raised. It in no way increased the stringency of the law, but proposed to carry out the present law in a more convenient way by transferring to the Minister of Marine the power, now vested in the Governor in Council, to order to what port a captured vessel should be taken.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought this objectionable, for if a vessel captured at the Bay Chaleurs should be ordered to Halifax or Quebec, great hardship and injustice might ensue.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it might be inconvenient and unsafe to take a vessel to the nearest port. No substantial change in the law was proposed but only one of convenience.

Hon. Mr. A. J. SMITH thought the change proposed very desirable, but objected to the captors receiving any pecuniary reward for a seizure.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said such an objection would only apply in case the seizing officer was a judicial officer and the principle of reward was carried out in the case of Customs and other Government officers.

Mr. MACKENZIE and Mr. CAMPBELL spoke as to the desirability of the proposed provisions.

The resolutions then passed through Committee, and a Bill was introduced and read a first time.

QUEBEC HARBOUR.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN the Act further to amend the Act respecting the improvement and management of the Harbour of Quebec, was read a sec-

ond time, and referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

ROCKWOOD ASYLUM.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. MORRIS the House went into Committee to consider a resolution to empower Government to treat with the Province of Ontario, for the lease or sale of Rockwood Asylum to that Province. Hon. Col. GREY in the chair.

The resolution, after some conversation, passed through Committee, and a Bill was introduced and read a first time.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

On the motion of Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution: That it is expedient in amending the Act respecting Insurance Companies, to provide for the appointment of an Inspector of Insurance Offices, to be remunerated by fees to be paid by such Companies and to be fixed by order of the Government, in Council not to exceed for any office in any one year. Hon. Col. GREY in the chair.

The Committee afterwards rose. report to be received to-morrow.

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY.

The Act to incorporate this Company after being amended in Committee, was read a second and third time, and passed.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS submitted the report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

The House then rose.

AFTER RECESS.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the reception of the report of the Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions respecting the admission of British Columbia into Union with Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that in the speech of the Hon. Minister of Militia, the statement had been made that one-third of the land in British Columbia was fit for agriculture. But it was admitted that this statement embraced the Island of Vancouver. Now, in dealing with this question, the Island must not be taken into consideration at all. From all the evidence he could obtain respecting the main land, not one-fifth of it was available for settle-

ment by farmers, and the remaining four fifths through which the road was likely to run, had yet to be proved good for mining purposes. It was simply absurd to put the price of that land at \$1 per acre. The Hon. Minister of Customs, in his speech the other evening, had advocated entering into an obligation which he could not say the country would be able to perform. It had been said the other evening over and over again during the debate, that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated that he regarded the construction of the Pacific Railway as a pressing political necessity. He denied having made any such statement. He would admit, however, that he would be willing to subject the country to some inconvenience in order to obtain communication with the Pacific through Canadian territory. He was in favour of opening up communication immediately through the country lying between the head of Lake Superior and Red River. From that point to the Rocky Mountains the way was comparatively easy and quite clear enough for the use of emigrants passing into the North West country. On the Pacific slope, there was no doubt that it would be necessary to expend large sums of money from time to time as the Financial condition of the Dominion permitted in opening up a good route to this side of the Rocky Mountains. But this country should not be bound to construct, within so short a time, such a gigantic work. The Grand Trunk had never yet paid one per cent. on the capital expended on it, though passing through a well peopled country and having no scarcity of traffic, yet the hon gentlemen opposite wished to lead the House to believe that this Pacific Railway which was to run for 2,500 miles through an uninhabited wilderness, would be a paying enterprise. We had unfortunately 200 miles lying between the head of Lake Superior and Winnipeg, which was an uninhabitable desert. Now, he would recommend a cheap narrow gauge railway with steamers on the smaller lakes, as the proper means of communication with the open prairie extending west of Fort Garry and through which it would be unnecessary to construct a road for years to come. He considered this attempt as one of the most foolish things that could be imagined—and what was it for? In order to get some 10,000 people into the Union, they were actually agreeing to pay \$10,000 a head on their account. Such terms argued either insane recklessness on the part of the Government and their supporters, or a painful want of patriotism, which would damage the country and the character of the hon. Minister of Militia. For thirty years to come it would be unnecessary to construct

the greater portion of this line. The only part of the road which would need to be constructed immediately was in British Columbia itself (hear, hear). He would be prepared to consider that as soon as estimates of the cost, &c., should be submitted to this House. Holding these views, he moved that all the words after "that" be omitted, and the following inserted:—"That having regard to the vast importance of the question involved in the said resolution including the obligation to construct within ten years the Pacific Railway, the cost of which is estimated to exceed one hundred millions of dollars, time should be afforded to the people and representatives for consultation before coming to a final decision, and that the said resolutions should therefore be postponed till next session."

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that he had hoped after the discussion of the last three days all the arguments against this measure would have been exhausted, and that he would not be called upon to speak again. But after the remarks just made by the hon. member for Lambton, he felt called upon to make some reply. He was willing to give credit to the hon. members who opposed this measure, for sincerity. He (Sir George) was much surprised, at the line of argument which they had followed. He was surprised that the member for Lambton should try to meet such a great question on the mere ground of cost. He admitted that the Union was a necessity and that the railway also was a necessity, but the honorable gentleman objected to be tied down to a specified time. He objected to being bound to build a line of 2,500 miles in ten years—but in past years even when the country was new and with comparatively few resources she had built 2,000 miles in eight years. Had Canada been ruined by those works, had her agricultural interests suffered on this account. And in addition to this, Canada had built the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, itself equal to 500 miles of railway, and other large bridges in different parts of the country. Had she suffered from building those works? No. It was true that the G. T. R. proprietors were not receiving so good a return as he would like. If the railway was practicable at all, every one would admit that it could well be built in ten years. If there had been any complaint it should have been that the time allowed was too long. When it had been proposed to extend the Customs Laws of Canada to Manitoba, it had been objected to as unfair, and that the people of that country were beyond the circle of Canada, and therefore a delay of three years had been allowed until the countries could be more

effectively joined and connected. Let the member for Lambton and his friends read their speeches on the North West question. Then no expense was too great, no haste too much, no trouble too great, if only the North West could be acquired, but now they said don't go so fast. He wanted to get hold of the Red River country at any cost, and now from the very same mouth that had spoken of the fertility of the North West, they heard the very opposite. He had then been willing to send any number of men to obtain possession of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE had stated his willingness to send any number of men not to acquire the country, but to establish the supremacy of law over insurrection.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER resumed the comparison of the expressions of the member for Lambton last year, and this, then he had stated distinctly that the acquisition of the North West would be the only way to obtain British Columbia, but now he did not want the Union.

Mr. MACKENZIE denied this, he was as much in favour of Union as ever.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the member for Lambton, had stated distinctly that in swallowing the Quebec scheme he had made a mistake, and now the great Reformer of Upper Canada, the representative of everything good, the representative of the great Party of Progress, said no, we must pull up, we must stop. The Government were really the Party of Progress and action, and the member for Lambton, and those who had followed him would at the next election be taken to task by their constituents for having in order to make a case against the Government made the humiliating confession that they had made a mistake in accepting the scheme of Confederation. The member for Lambton in his argument had said that between Thunder Bay and Fort Garry there was no soil and the rail way could not be built but that question could be settled by Parliament hereafter, when the railway scheme should be submitted.

Mr. MACKENZIE—What about the obligations?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said, suppose the hon. gentleman undertook an obligation, could he be obliged to fulfil it, if he should be prevented by unforeseen circumstances. No one could be compelled to perform an impossibility. The time was too long, and the objection could only come from an economical Scotchman, and he would predict that in a very few years the hon. gentleman would be one of the most ardent supporters of the

railway. He had not been sorry to lose his motion yesterday, and he was not sincere in his present proposal. That proposal was to entail a delay of seven months, what object could there be in so doing? The matter had already been discussed sufficiently, and the time was now come for settlement, and he would say that without the prospect of British Columbia, they would never have persuaded a majority of the House to consent to acquire one inch of the North West. For the sake of the member for Lambton himself he trusted his speech would not be well reported, and especially that part in which he had spoken of the character of the land in most disadvantageous terms, and yet he said he was in favour of building a railway as soon as possible. If the land was as described by the hon. member, why should a railway be built at all? He reiterated 10 years was too long, and as to the mode of building the railway that would all be submitted to Parliament, and within the next few days the Government would ask for an appropriation for the preliminary survey. He maintained that Canada was better able to-day to undertake the Pacific railway than she had been years ago to advance fifteen millions to the Grand Trunk. The whole affair of the hundred millions was a bugbear. There was no such thing as incurring that debt in a few years—it was an absurdity to make such a statement. The policy was purposely to retain the lands of the country in order to build railways and open ways of communication. Canada would not have to bear the expenditure alone. British Columbia would be represented in the House, and would be equally interested in the work. Speaking of the cost of the railway, he maintained the gentlemen on the other side had played the parts of old nurses, but the children on his side the House were not so easily frightened. He spoke of the North Pacific, quoting from a statement shewing the whole length to be 2,000 miles, and the entire estimated cost seventy-six million dollars in greenbacks. It had been objected that the estimate for the Canadian Pacific might not be correct. He admitted that, but the argument worked both ways. The cost might prove very much below the estimate, and an immense amount of land was reserved to cover it. He quoted a statement shewing the average cost of railway communication in the United States, shewing 2,600 miles of line in operation, the average cost being, in the different States, from \$25,000 to \$33,000 per mile. It was admitted that there was a large extent of prairie land to be crossed, and the smaller expenditure necessary there would leave means to

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

overcome difficulties in other portions. The hon. members opposite had been sufficiently unpatriotic to represent the country as that it would never attract immigration, and he quoted from the proceedings of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota speaking of the Canadian line as practicable, and the territories of the North West and British Columbia, as fertile, and the most valuable of the Continent; and yet men in this country, the leaders of their party, did their utmost to decry their country.

Mr. MACKENZIE denied that he had done anything to decry the country.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER was glad he had given the hon. member an opportunity to correct himself. He quoted from an article from an American paper, copied into the *Globe*, characterising the Saskatchewan country as most valuable in soil and minerals, and British Columbia as possessing rich mineral resources, magnificent climate and fine soil. It was fortunate that the truth could be ascertained even if it came from opponents. The Government had stated again and again that they themselves would not build the railway, but that it would be constructed by Companies assisted by such subsidies as would not oppress the people. It was absurd to speak of building a line to the Rocky Mountains only, a vote could not be obtained for such a purpose, but when it was proposed to extend the line to the ocean, the question assumed a very different aspect. Many great works had been accomplished in England, but what were any of these compared with the scheme now proposed, and he could say that already there was a motion in England to assist the measure, and there would doubtless be capitalists to take the matter in hand, and everything was in favor of the successful construction of the road. The Minister of Justice had telegraphed him to present his congratulations to his friends on the vote of yesterday.

Mr. BLAKE said the member for Lambton in his amendment had pointed out the importance of the matter, the grave nature of the burden proposed to be incurred, and therefore suggested the postponement of the consideration of the matter, and it was impossible to answer those statements. Much had been heard that the railway would not cost the Dominion in cash \$100,000,000, but no one attempted to deny that the railway would cost that amount and where could the money come from but from the resources of the country. It might be in lands and it might be in money, but the result was the same, and the only argument the Minister of Militia had used was to speak of the

American lines and contrast greenbacks with gold. He complained of the system of alternate sections not being followed in the land grants. The argument seemed to be that they would not be compelled to perform impossibilities, but an honest man would fulfil an obligation, though the result might be bankruptcy. If rashly the national credit and faith were pledged to build that road in ten years, he said that any one who voted for that obligation with the mental reservation that they would not be compelled to fulfil the obligation unless such should be desirable was a base man. The spirit and the letter of the bond were alike binding, and the question was most serious. The Bill was not one that could be repealed but was an irrevocable determination to build the road in ten years whatever the hazard, whatever the results, and should they not seek to communicate with their people before arriving at this irrevocable determination. It had been urged in order to secure votes that there was a reserve power of repudiation, but if the obligation was undertaken, the people would hold themselves bound by it, and could gentlemen be prepared to meet an indignant people if they incurred this responsibility without consulting those they represented, and if gentlemen did so act, though they might go back to their people, they would not come back to that House. The question was whether the debt of the country should, at a stroke, be doubled, or whether they should have an opportunity of consulting their people before taking such a step. They had been urged to haste, but he maintained that there had been too much haste in bringing about Confederation already, and he was not anxious to ruin entirely that portion of the scheme which had been too hastily consummated. He had not heard what harm could result from postponement and as to the argument that British Columbia was hanging in the balance, he would say that while England was true to herself, the result did not lie with British Columbia, and therefore time for consideration should not be refused.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said it was a great advantage to be able to hear both sides of a question, but he could see no very great difference in the proposition of the Government and the amendment proposed. The hon. member for Lambton after his defeat last night was obliged to adopt the more successful stand which had been taken by the hon. member for Dundas. There was no talk about the necessity of this delay from the hon. gentleman opposite before this evening. It was all very well to ask for this delay now, but the scheme had been before the peo-

ple and been discussed in the papers for months. The terms were published in Toronto papers three months ago, and, in fact, the Union had been talked of ever since the commencement of the Confederation. In reply to the arguments of the hon. members opposite, he said that a grant of \$10,000 per mile in addition to the land grant would place the construction of the railway beyond the possibility of a doubt. There could be no difficulty in disposing of the lands at a fair price. The fertile belt was spoken of by American writers who had visited it, as being of immense extent and of great fertility. The Northern Pacific Railway looked to it for a portion of their future trade. It was, therefore, in the interest of this Dominion to construct a road through our own territory to the Pacific.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the House should not be led away by clap-netraps speeches from the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let them look at the facts. Here was a statement of Mr. Hind, an officer appointed by this Government, who explored the North West, and submitted his report thereon. This gentleman stated that in the whole of the fertile belt there were not 40,000,000 acres of available land. Taking a fertile belt in the Rocky Mountains which was mentioned in that report, to contain 10,000,000 acres more, there were but 50,000,000 acres of any commercial or exchangeable value, in the North West. Where then were the Government lands to come from after granting large sections to the railway. The experience of the United States had shown that it was not in the interest of a country to grant its unsettled lands in large blocks to private companies. The proposition before the House was to give all the valuable lands of the North West to a company which was not yet formed. After the experience of English capitalists on Canadian railways, it was not likely that capital could be got to construct this railway. The money must be had in some way even at the risk of involving the Dominion in ruin. In reply to the statement of the Hon. Minister of Customs that this question had been before the public for some time, he would refer to the hon. gentleman to the files of papers in the reading room. If he would look at them he would see that the country was startled at the gigantic proportions of this scheme. On the 27th of that month, the *ipsissima verba* of the scheme were presented to this House, and that was the first time the public had an opportunity of passing judgment on it. It was only after it was taken up and discussed in this House the other day, that it might be said

Mr. Blake.

to have been placed before the people. Could the hon. gentleman, then deny that delay should be granted before passing this measure. It had not been presented to the House in the constitutional manner and it was only right to give the people an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of it.

Mr. JONES, (Leeds), said though both sides deprecated the party considerations, he had never heard a question made so completely one of party. He did not think the country was in a position to undertake the expenditure proposed. He considered the Imperial Government ought to share in the expense of any scheme for opening up the North West. He maintained that the country was not suitable for settlement, or the present population would have been much larger. He objected to the Indians being taken into account, as they had done but little good to Canada. He was in favor of the consideration of the matter being postponed and should vote for the amendment.

Mr. BOLTON, (Charlotte), in explaining the reference made to him by the Minister of Customs, said he had not charged him with making reckless statements, but that while giving him and the Government every credit for being in earnest in desiring to construct the road, he thought it very doubtful whether a company would be found to undertake it.

Mr. MACKENZIE'S amendment was then put, and the following vote taken:—
Yeas, 68; nays, 85.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Bertrand, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Joly, Jones, (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Kempt, Killam, Macdonald, [Glengarry] MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall, [Lanark] McDougall [Renfrew], Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison [Victoria, O.], Munroe, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross [Dundas], Ross [Prince Edward] Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Ryman, Scatcherd, Smith, [Westmoreland], Snider, Simon, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young—68.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford (Leeds) Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald, (Lunenburg), McDonald, (Middlesex), Mason (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall, (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Poulois, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain) Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street,

Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, White (East Hastings), Wilson and Wright (Ottawa County).—85.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT believed that the Government had been led into the inconceivable blunder of naming a period for the construction of the road and the amendment he was about to propose differed from others in these respects, it did not interfere with the pledge to commence the railway, and only pledged that they would use their utmost exertions to go on with the work as fast as practicable, and it need involve but a very short delay. He moved that the eleventh paragraph should be amended by inserting the words "to use their utmost exertions" after the word "further."

The amendment was put and lost on the following division:—

Yeas, 7; nays, 135.

YEAS.—Messrs. Bodwell, Cameron (Huron), Cartwright, Galt, [Sir Alexander T.] McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], and Mills.—7.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bourassa, Bow, Bowll, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burton, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir Geo. E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Cheval, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford (Leeds), Daoust, Delorme, Dobbie, Dorion, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hagar, Heath, Holmes, Holton, Hurdon, [Irvine, Jackson, Joly, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Keeler, Kempt, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Glengarry], McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), McFarlane, McKenzie, Magill, Masson, (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McConkey, McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Metcalfe, Moffatt, Morris, Morison [Victoria, O.], Morison [Niagara], Munroe, O'Connor, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Pozer, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Ryan [Montreal West], Rymal, Savary, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stephenson, Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson [Ontario], Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Wells, White [Halton], White, [East Hastings], Whitehead, Wilson, Wood, Workman, Wright, [Ottawa County] Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.] and Young—135.

Mr. BODWELL moved in amendment to leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following: "That the proposed terms of Union with British Columbia provide for representation in the Senate by three members, and in the House of Commons by six members, while its population is about 10,000, and that such representation in the House of Commons is enormously in excess of the proper number according to the population, and is in violation of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, a principle which ought not to be disturbed without the consent of the Provinces, and that the said resolutions be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of reducing

the number of representatives in the House of Commons."

Mr. KILLAM then moved in amendment to the amendment, that the words "while its population is about 10,000" be struck out.

Mr. KILLAM'S amendment was rejected on the following division:—

Yeas, 43; nays, 100.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bowman, Burpee, Cameon (Huron), Carmichael, Cheval, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Ferris, Fournier, Geoffrion, Holton, Huntingdon, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Kempt, Killam, MacDonald [Glengarry], MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Renfrew), Metcalfe, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith, [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wells, Whitehead, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.] and Young—43.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bowell, Bourassa, Bown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Cayley, Chauveau, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford (Leeds), Daoust, Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortier, Fortin, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morison, [Niagara], Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Pozer, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ryan, [Montreal West], Savary, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White [Halton], White [East Hastings], Wilson, and Wood—100.

Mr. BODWELL'S amendment was then put, and the vote resulted as follows: Yeas, 58; Nays, 87.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bourassa, Bowman, Brown, Burpee, Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Geoffrion, Godin, Holton, Huntingdon, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Killam, MacDonald [Glengarry], MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], Metcalfe, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young—58.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron (Huron), Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross,

(Dundas), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scriven, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (East Hastings), and Wilson—87.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment to leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following: The proposed terms of Union with British Columbia, provide for the payment by the Dominion of a yearly sum of \$100,000, in perpetuity, equal to the capital sum of \$2,000,000, for the cession of a tract of waste land on the route of the proposed Pacific Railway, to aid in its construction while any such land required for that purpose should be ceded without charge in like manner as the lands of the Dominion are to be ceded, and that the said resolutions be referred to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same in accordance with this resolution.

The amendment was put and the vote was as follows: Yeas, 59; Nays, 84.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bourassa, Bowman, Brown, Burpee, Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Coupal, Delorme, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Holton, Huntington, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Killam, Lawson, Macdonald (Glengarry), McFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Renfrew), Metcalfe, Mills, Morison, (Victoria), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith (Westmoreland), Snider, Stirling, Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—59.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaulieu, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Burton, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Colby, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Heath, Holmes, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scriven, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (East Hastings), Wilson and Wright (Ottawa County).—84.

The first, second, and third resolutions were carried.

Hon Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that an address, embodying the said resolutions be presented to Her Majesty, and that a Select Committee, composed, of the Hon. Messrs. Tilley, Morris, Tupper, Chauveau, Messrs. Ferguson, Savary, and the mover be appointed to draft such address.—Carried.

The Committee presented the draft address, which was received and read a first time, to be read a second time, at the next Session of the House.

The House adjourned at 1:45, a.m.

Mr. Blake.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, April 1, 1871.

After routine,

DOMINION CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. CURRIER introduced a Bill to incorporate the Dominion Construction Co.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the second reading of the Bill respecting Insurance companies.

Mr. BLAKE objected to the measure, as limiting the class of securities to be deposited with the Government. He also objected to establishing a system of inspection.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS assured the hon. member that there was no disposition to limit the class of securities, but, on the contrary, to relieve companies of the necessity of depositing cash with the Government.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of the Address to Her Majesty for the union of British Columbia with the Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE did not propose to reply to the speeches of the hon. members opposite delivered last night. They extended over a good space of time, but there was nothing in them. He merely wished to enter his protest against the extraordinary address now about to be read a second time. He, therefore, moved the following: Resolved that this House, while willing to give its best consideration to any reasonable terms of union with British Columbia, is of opinion that the terms embodied in the said address are so unreasonable and unjust to Canada that this House should not agree thereto."

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he had not taken any part in the debates on this subject so far. He had listened with mingled pain and pleasure to the speeches of hon. members. He had heard with pain old friends of Confederation opposing this union movement. He defended the policy of the Government at considerable length, arguing that everything conspired to favor the construction of the Pacific railway. While the United States had to contend against great natural difficulties in pushing their railways to the Pacific, the territory through which the Canadian route

would lie, was of great natural fertility, and presented comparatively few engineering difficulties to the construction of a railway. It gave us a pass through the Rocky Mountains 2,000 feet lower than the best pass through that chain on American territory. The hon. member for Lambton had endeavored to show that the route from Nipissing to Fort Garry was an almost impassable wilderness. Only last session the hon. member had taken a very different view of the question and had stated that the very best route to the west lay through Canadian territory North of Lakes Huron and Superior. The hon. gentleman could not say that he had heard anything to present the matter in a different light. There were then, all these favourable circumstances to aid this great enterprise, but in addition to all that, the route once opened would place Canton and Liverpool 1,000 miles nearer than by any other line of communication that could be found. The hon. member had pleaded for delay in order to submit this question to the people, but the hon. gentleman had taken the ground on a former occasion that Parliament, representing the people, could act for them in a case like this.

Mr. MACKENZIE said this was a very different matter. When the Confederation Scheme was first mooted he (Mr. Mackenzie) went before his constituents and presented the matter to them in twenty speeches held in different parts of his constituency and told them that if they were not favourable to Confederation they might elect some one who would oppose it in Parliament, he would not.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER admitted that the honourable member for Lambton was an important member of the House, and honoured the intelligent electors who sent him to Parliament, but he did not represent the whole people, and the Confederation scheme was not submitted to the country generally. But this question had been submitted to the people of British Columbia and the terms had been accepted by them. It was not new to the people of Canada. Six months ago the *Toronto Globe* had published the terms and they had appeared in other leading papers. No objections were urged against them that he had heard of, till now. He did not believe the people were so wanting in intelligence that they would silently submit to terms which did not meet their approval without protesting against them. When a small question of duties came before this Parliament, the people who disapproved of them petitioned against them, and the Press generally discussed the question very thoroughly. It

was absurd, therefore, in the face of these facts to say that the people were taken by surprise on this question, or that the scheme met with their disapproval. But if this House had accepted the position which the hon. members of the opposition wished to force the country into, they would bring discredit on this country which would probably be fraught with consequences which might be irreparable. The hon. member for Sherbrooke had raised a question as to how far this enterprise lay within our means. The hon. member had done better justice to the position of the Dominion in a former speech in which he had depicted the prosperity which Confederation had brought upon the country. It showed that the hon. member who first presented Confederation in a tangible shape, in the year 1858, had spoken with prophetic zeal when he referred to it as the great means of elevating them, not only in the political, but in the financial and commercial scale. The friends of Union might proudly point to the present position of the Dominion as irrefragable proof of the correctness of that statement for the prophecy had been more than realized. The Confederation was but a movement of yesterday, and the result already was a large surplus in the treasury after meeting all the Dominion engagements that the necessities of the local Governments required, and the Government of this Dominion could come down, and not only point to the prosperity of every one of its component parts, but, at the same time, show that this Dominion had entered on a career of financial prosperity hitherto unknown to Canada. If this had been the result in the past, what might we not expect in the future. Two years ago the hon. member for Sherbrooke, in his criticism on the budget speech, had complained of what was not in it, rather than of what it did contain, and had said that some provision should have been made for opening up the North West. He (Dr. Tupper) thought the Government deserved credit rather than censure for having adopted the suggestion (a laugh.) In reply to the objections of the hon. member for Lambton about the cost of the proposed railway, he referred to the fact that its construction would be undertaken by a private company. No one had disputed the necessity of providing means of communication with the North West in order to settle it, yet hon. gentlemen opposite complained that large grants of land should be made to any company undertaking the construction of a railway. Yet it was only by means of a railway that the country could ever be settled, and the

Dominion could give infinitely better land for the purpose than the United States had offered or could now offer to American companies. The reservation of large blocks of lands, which would be greatly enhanced in value through the construction of this railway, would enable the Government to cover largely any outlay they should be called on to make. Confederation had changed the whole story of financial deficit, and had enabled Parliament the other day, partly without our consent, to reduce the taxation of the country by \$1,000,000—this, too, at a time when we were constructing the Intercolonial and other kindred works and preparing to improve the canal system of the country—without embarrassing the Government. He believed, also, that if this railway were built, the Northern Pacific road would either be abandoned or become a branch of the Canadian Pacific. It could never compete with our line, running as it did through a much less fertile country than our North West, and lying between our line and the Central Pacific route. This union was a question of such magnitude, when regarded in the light of the status it was going to give to this Dominion that it naturally tempted him to descend upon it. He believed God and nature had placed it in the power of this Parliament to take up this question and give us advantages in connection with becoming the great highway of communication, not only across this continent, but between Europe and Asia. The Government would be recreant to their trust if they failed to meet the wishes of this country as expressed by the majority in this Parliament and carry this Union forward to a successful issue (cheers).

Mr. SCATCHERD was surprised to find that in the debate on the present question there was less enthusiasm than was shown on the first scheme of Confederation. He complained that only one party to this compact, the people of British Columbia had had an opportunity of pronouncing on this subject, while the greater party of the people of Canada had received no such opportunity. Already we had the Intercolonial Railway on our hands, for which we had had to submit to increased expenditure and taxation. Yet we were told that a larger and more difficult work would not add to our burdens. A more monstrous and unreasonable proposition was never urged than that this vast road could be built without increasing the burdens of the people. He held that Confederation so far had not proved the success predicted. In various sections there were jealousy, ill-feeling and discontent in relation to this Union, and three sections, Nova Scotia, Quebec

and Manitoba might be cited in support of his theory that Confederation had not been very satisfactory. He saw no difference between the position of the minority in 1865, and that of the minority now. The conduct of the Government was as unreasonable and arbitrary now as then. He believed this scheme would but add to difficulties and taxation and to the burdens of the country, and that its ill effects would be felt for 50 years. Holding these opinions he would vote for the amendment.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON said he was prepared and desirous to see this scheme of Confederation carried to a magnificent success, and that he was prepared to go quite as far as the hon. member for Cumberland, or indeed any one, in the great scheme of Confederation, but while he claimed credit for earnestly and sincerely entertaining the desire to consummate successfully that great scheme, he could not shut his eyes to the fact that, confederation was not a machine that would run without winding, but that it contained many details which from time to time required serious consideration. When the Dominion Parliament had first assembled, the obligations of the country had been largely increased, and now all at once the whole debt of the country was to be doubled. Surely this was a serious matter, and even the Hon. Minister of Militia had termed it a "big job" though he had afterwards tried to make it appear a very little job. It was useless to say that the country would not be expected to accomplish impossibilities, and that no burden would be added to the people, for when they had entered into a compact, they must carry out their promise, and when they went to England to raise money they would find this obligation considered a charge on the credit of the country. Notwithstanding the glowing terms in which the grandeur of Confederation had been depicted, the fact still remained that the debt had first been increased fifty per cent. and now it was sought to be doubled. He maintained, however, that the measure of Confederation had been carried, not by the Government, but in consequence of the loyal respect of the people for the policy of the Imperial Government which was known to favor the scheme, and now the Government was breaking away if not from Imperial policy at least from Imperial aid, in proposing to carry out the work of communication alone and unassisted. If it had been the duty and the policy of the Imperial Government to aid in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway it was a hundred fold more their duty and policy to aid in the construction of the Pacific, and he

would ask the Government for what reasons they had absolved the Imperial Government from all duties in the work of consolidating British power on this continent. He referred to rumours which he said had been circulated to the effect that the Government had been greatly influenced by the presence of Capitalists and Contractors who were opposed to the Northern Pacific Railway, and who thought that if the Canadian Government would decide definitely to construct the Canadian line, it would operate strongly against the Northern Pacific, and said he could not but think that those rumours had gained weight by the utterance of the President of the Council that if the Canadian line was constructed the Northern Pacific would never get beyond Red River. That hon. gentleman had also urged as a reason for hurry in this matter, that if they did not hasten to accept the terms proposed, British Columbia might exact conditions still more difficult, but such an argument was absurd. British Columbia was a Crown colony, and if it were really, the policy of the Imperial Government, to consolidate British power on this continent, though every man in that colony might be in favor of annexation, their power to bring about such a result would be as light as a feather, it would be as nothing. If ever the British possessions on this Continent should become part of the United States, it could only be at the cannon's mouth, and as the consequence of the total ruin and prostration of British power on this continent. The same reason for hurry had been urged in the discussion on Confederation, and he very much deprecated it as tending very much to unsettle the minds of the people. These great questions should be discussed solely on their merits without the fulmination of insincerities in regard to alternatives that might ensue in case of the scheme being rejected. He had no doubt that many, hon. gentlemen, had been writing to their constituents speaking of the wonderful benefits of Confederation as evinced in their being no longer a deficiency in the revenue, but a surplus of two millions, and he could not but commiserate them in having now to write that that surplus of two millions had disappeared to be replaced by a debt of one hundred millions.

MR. RYMAL had hoped that the Government would have been forced to explain in what way the money for the railway was to be raised. He ventured to say that the Minister of Finance was not properly performing the functions of his office, in failing to explain fully the financial aspect of the matter. He feared nothing he could say would change one single vote, but he was convinced that if the question had

been one of policy and not of party, the resolutions would never have been carried. Richelieu had said that many persons who, as private members might be saved, were in great danger of being damned for having wandered into public life, and if Richelieu had lived in these days and uttered those words, he (Mr. Rymal) would have been quite sure that his eyes were fixed on the gentlemen of the Canadian Government.

MR. THOMPSON (Ontario) desired to explain why he should support the amendment, which was because no explanation had even been attempted as to how so large a debt as that proposed could be incurred without crippling most seriously the resources of the country.

MR. MACKENZIE'S amendment was then put with the following result: Yeas, 68; Nays, 86.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Béchard, Bertrand, Blake, Bodwell Bolton, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron [Huron], Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Chipman, Coupal, Dolorme [St. Hyacinthe], Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Godin, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Kempt, Killam, Macdonald [Glengarry], MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McCallum, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison [Victoria O.], Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pozer, Redford, Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Victoria, N.S.], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Haltom], Whitehead, Wood, Workman, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—68

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Brown, Burton, Cameron, [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Chauveau, Colby, Costigan, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Daoust, Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Grey, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Ross (Champlain), Ryan (King's, N. B.), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith

(Selkirk), Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (East Hastings), Willson, and Wright (Ottawa County).—86.

On the amendment being declared lost.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT rose and said, it might be considered that the address was practically carried, but he desired before the final passage, to place on record an explanation of the terms under which the address was understood to be adopted. The Government had stated as a reason why these terms should be accepted, that it was not their intention to undertake the whole cost of the railway out of the money reserves of the Dominion, but that they proposed to do it through the intervention of companies to whom they would be prepared to give subsidies of land and money, and further that this was the understanding between themselves and the delegates from British Columbia. He therefore moved:—That the said address be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time on Monday, and that meantime, it be resolved in accepting the terms of the Union with British Columbia, that this House understands that the engagement for the construction of the Pacific Railway within ten years, is subject to the understanding had between the Government of the Dominion, and the Commissioners from British Columbia that the said railway should be constructed through the medium of private companies receiving subsidies in money and land, and that it was not intended to pledge the Dominion beyond the obligation of its money resources to the loyal and earnest prosecution of the work, without entailing undue and excessive burdens on the country.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said this amendment was equally objectionable with the others that had been moved to prevent the passing of the address, and he would announce to the House, and to the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that the Government intended and determined that this great railway should be carried out by companies, and not by the Government, and through the means principally of land grants and small money subsidies; and further that early in the ensuing week, the Government would place before the House a resolution by which to take the sense of the House with regard to the manner in which that Railway should be built, and he might announce beforehand that the determination of the Government was that, when the sense of the House had been so taken, they would carry it out more prudently with regard to the Exchequer of the country than was proposed in the

Mr. Mackenzie.

amendment of the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the terms of the amendment were so general that he was not prepared to vote for it.

Mr. BLAKE said he must oppose the amendment not only for the reason named by the hon. member for Lambton, but because he considered that no action of the House could put an interpretation on the terms of the resolutions other than those they literally contained.

Mr. BOWELL said his great objection to the amendment was that it did not go far enough for it would not prevent the Government from carrying on the Railway after its construction.

The amendment was lost, the vote being—Yeas, 7; Nays, 126.

YEAS.—Messrs. Cartwright, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Killam, Kirkpatrick, Langlois, McFarlane and Pope.—7.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Beaty, Beaubien, Bechard, Bellerose, Benoit, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowell, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Burton, Cameron (Huron), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cayley, Chauveau, Cheval, Chipman, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford, (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Delorme, (St. Hyacinthe), Dobbie, Dorion, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Grey, Grover, Hagar, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holton, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Joly, Keeler, Kempt, Lacerte, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, Macdonald (Glengarry), McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), Mackenzie, Magill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Renfrew), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, McMonies, Merritt, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morison, (Victoria, O.), Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Renaud, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C.R.), Ryan (King's, N. B.), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Scatcherd, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Smith (Westmoreland), Snider, Stephenson, Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Willson and Young—126.

The main motion was then carried and the address read a second time, and on the motion of

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, the ad-

dress was ordered to be engrossed, and a motion for an address to His Excellency, praying His Excellency to transmit the address to Her Majesty the Queen was carried; the address to His Excellency was ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented by such members of the House as belonged to the Privy Council.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

The following Private and Local Bills were read a second and third time and passed:—

An Act to comprise in one Act the financial affairs of the Great Western Railway Company, as amended by the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

An Act concerning the Vaudreuil Railway Company, as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

An Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank, as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

An Act to incorporate the Western Bank, as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

On the motion of Hon. Sir F. HINCKS to go into Committee of Supply,

MONTREAL WAREHOUSING COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON called the attention of the Government to the manner in which a certain parcel of land belonging to the Dominion was leased to the Montreal Warehousing Company. The history of the land was this: In 1865 Government purchased from private parties in Montreal a lot of land adjoining the Canal basin, on the recommendation of Mr. Allan, for the purpose of increasing the wharfage and shed accommodation there. For this lot the Government paid the sum of \$25,000. The Warehousing Co., through Mr. Brydges, made application to Government for the purchase of the lot subsequent to Confederation of the Provinces, but on the advice of the officers of the Public Works Department, the Government refused to sell it. On the 19th July, 1870, the Hon. the Minister of Militia, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, and acting for that Minister, reported to the Council in favor of granting the lease of this lot to the Warehousing Company for a term of 21 years at an annual rental of \$700, that being considered less than simple interest on one half the cost. This report was made to the Privy Council without being supported by any of the professional gentlemen connected with the

Department. One of the conditions, however, was that the Government might resume possession of the property on giving three month's notice, on condition of paying for any building that might be erected thereon subsequent to the lease of the property. He, therefore, moved an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, reciting the facts above stated, and resolving "that this House is of opinion that it is the duty of this Government to take immediate steps to resume possession for public uses, of said lot of ground."

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he would take the full responsibility of the transaction on himself. He had no desire to shield himself behind the Minister of Militia in this matter. The action in the matter was taken while he (Mr. Langevin) was absent, but it was with his entire approval. What he had to complain of was that the hon. member for Chateauguay had not gone farther back in the history of this affair. The hon. member knew quite well that in order to arrive at the true position of affairs, it was necessary to go back farther than 1865. In 1851 the Government of the day offered for sale by public auction a number of lots on the Lachine Canal basin. Some of these lots were purchased by Messrs. Hooker and Holton, and three by the Hon. John Young. A few years afterwards Messrs. Hooker and Holton sold their lots to Hon. John Young for four thousand pounds, making a very handsome profit by the transaction. The action of the Government at that time met the approval of the hon. gentleman, and was a very nice transaction for him.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON felt that he must interrupt the hon. gentleman. He strongly disapproved of the sale of those lots by the Government in 1851 as a matter of public policy, but he attended the sale and purchased the lots as a merchant doing business in Montreal. He invested in them as a good speculation.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN was prepared to show the hon. member his opinion about the sale of those lots. At the time they were sold the Government still retained possession of all that land within 70 feet of the Canal basin. It was then felt that it was a very great inconvenience that warehouses should be 70 feet back from the wharf, and a great deal of pressure was brought to bear upon the Department of Public Works—not to induce them to save the lands for public purposes, not on the plea that it would benefit the country, but with a view to induce the Government to sell a little more land, to give up all the land on this side of the Canal basin within ten feet of the wharf. An applica-

tion to the foregoing effect was made by the Hon. John Young in 1854. That gentleman now agreed with the hon. member for Chateauguay that the land should not be sold, but in 1854 he applied to the Government to purchase that same land which the Montreal Warehousing Company now asked for, a company incorporated by the Parliament, the preamble of whose Act of incorporation sets forth that the warehouses to be erected were for public purposes. The application submitted by the Hon. John Young made it appear that the wharfage accommodation would be improved by the erection of warehouses there, and that no inconvenience to the public could result. But the Hon. John Young, in sending that application, sent with it a certificate signed by Mr. Luther Holton and a large number of influential merchants and forwarders of Montreal highly approving of the scheme. His hon. friend in May 1859 thought that this whole ground should be covered with warehouses owned by his friend, the Hon. John Young, but in 1870 he found that the same land should not be occupied by the Montreal Warehousing Company. He (Mr. Langevin) thought he would be able to show the hon. gentleman's opinions had changed. Moreover, the Montreal Board of Trade at the same date (1859) passed resolutions which were adopted unanimously, by which they declared their opinion that the property then in the hands of the Hon. Mr. Young, and now in those of the Montreal Warehousing Company, should be covered by warehouses, the trade requiring that accommodation. He went on to show that the property leased for 21 years to the Montreal Warehousing Company, could not be expected to yield a larger rent than \$700 per annum, when coupled with the rent were the following conditions, viz.: That at any time the Government could resume possession of the property on giving three month's notice, and that the wharf was to be free to all parties, and the front of the wharf should not be occupied to the exclusion of vessels belonging to third parties, which would have the right to trade and unload there without hindrance. The hon. member for Chateauguay had said that this property should not have been leased because Mr. Page recommended that it should not be leased. In matters, of engineering the Government abode by the recommendations of the chief engineer, but in matters affecting trade they preferred to act with the approval of such undeniably good authorities as the forwarders of Montreal, the Montreal Board of Trade and the now hon. member for Chateauguay.

Hon. Mr. Langevin.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Recommendations made twelve years ago.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—What was good twelve years ago held good now. Mr. Page objected to the leasing of this property because the wharf should be open to the public. The Order in Council reserved the right to the public to come to that wharf, to load and unload vessels there, and keep open fifteen feet back from the wharf so that carts might pass with freight.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—The street is not there, it is built over.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—There never was a street there. The hon. member, as a citizen of Montreal, knew what steps he ought to take in the matter. The hon. gentleman complained that the price was too low. In 1856 the property was sold for four thousand pounds, and the hon. gentleman knew that when in 1859 he endeavored to induce the Government to sell that land he was endeavoring to protect his own mortgage.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—I will call the hon. gentleman to order. Since 1854, when I sold out my interest on that property to Mr. Hooker, I had no interest in that land. The hon. member should not make accusations; they are ungentlemanly.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN could not do otherwise than admit that what the hon. member had said was correct. After some explanations, he contended that Government were subsequently obliged to buy back that property purchased by the Hon. John Young to protect themselves. They held a mortgage on the property amounting to eighteen or twenty thousand dollars, —he thought the latter was the correct figure. The property was purchased at a rate higher than its actual value. He proceeded to quote the prices paid for property in proof of what he had said, and showed that land in the immediate vicinity, notably that on which Mr. Young's elevating warehouse was situated and the Seminary property at the corner, had been sold at 30 to 36 cents a foot after deducting the price of the buildings. The rental paid by the Montreal Warehousing Company afforded, therefore, a fair rate of interest on the value of the property. The hon. gentleman explained that the property had not been put up for public competition. The principle had been established by other governments that property on the Lachine and other canals might be sold on valuation. He cited instances of such transactions, which had taken place while the hon. members for Hochelaga and Chateauguay were members of the Cabinet. The hon. member spoke very highly of that lot of land. The fact was however,

that it had never been put to any use. The Government had leased it to the Montreal Warehousing Company at \$700 per annum, which was so much in the Treasury. Besides that the Warehousing Company was erecting large warehouses, which would afford three times the accommodation which the mere wharf would have done. With these statements he left the matter in the hands of the House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the principle advanced by the member for Chateauguay, was that the Government should always sell its property by public auction, but that was not the principle of the Government, nor was it desirable that it should be. The transaction had been termed a sale, but it was not a sale, many applications had been made to Government to purchase the land, but they were refused; but afterwards, a Company was formed to carry on the business of warehousing, and the property was leased, not sold, with a view merely to meet the wants of the increasing trade of Montreal, on the condition that if the land was required for public uses, the Company should relinquish it after three months' notice, and, of course, the same money would not be paid for the land on such a condition, as if it had been an absolute sale. The motion proposed that the Government should resume the property, and it had been stated that buildings had been erected, and, therefore, if the property were resumed, the Government would have to pay the value of those buildings, an expenditure for which there was no appropriation, and the Government could not assent to this proceeding merely to please the hon. member for Chateauguay.

Mr. WORKMAN maintained that a 21 years' lease was equivalent to a sale—and if there was a power of resumption, that power should be exercised.

Hon. Mr. DORION complained that any sale should be made contrary to the advice of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, and that it should have been effected privately—and said the transaction might be considered a sale as the Government could not resume possession, except under penalty of paying the value of any buildings that might be erected. He hoped the Government would be forced to accept the motion and resume possession of the property.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the Engineer's report should not have been asked for if it was not to be acted upon. The matter not only affected the merchants of Montreal but the producers of the West, and the whole matter could only be regarded as a "job." The property was certainly sold for twenty-one years.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said it had been tried to be shown that the lease was a sale, but such was not the case, for the Government could resume possession at any time on three months' notice, and it was also provided that any buildings erected should be either stone or brick, and that the wharf property in front should be open to public use. The Company had taken a lease of the property for warehousing as well, as Mr. L. H. Holton, who is now the hon. member for Chateauguay, and the Board of Trade had urged that that very property should be improved for that purpose, and, therefore, the wishes of the Board of Trade had been carried out. If more accommodation was necessary there was plenty of available ground in the immediate vicinity, and that ground belonged to the Government.

Mr. BLAKE opposed the action of the Government, and said they had shown no cause why the redemption clause, which they admitted, should not be acted on.

The amendment was put and the vote was: Yeas, 38; nays, 59.

YEAS—Messrs. Anglin, Bechard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Carmichael, Cheval, Delorme, Dorion, Fortier, Fournier, Holton, Huntington, Joly, Jones [Halifax], Kempt, Killam, MacKenzie, McDougall [Renfrew], Mills, Morrison, [Victoria, O.], Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pözer, Redford, Ross [Prince Edward], Ross [Wellington, C.E.], Ryan Montreal West, Rymal, Scatcherd, Stirling, Thompson [Haldimand], White [Halton], Whitehead, Workman, and Young.—38.

NAYS—Messrs. Archambeault, Beaubien, Belrose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Costigan, Crawford [Leeds], Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Jackson, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, Masson, [Soulanges], McCallum, McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, McMillan, Merritt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], Perry, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Ray, Renaud, Ross [Champlain], Savary, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Sylvain, Tilley, Toisanneau, Turper, Walsh, Webb, and White [East Hastings].—59.

OFFICIAL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS.

Mr. BLAKE called attention to a report that Mr. Daly, one of the Census Commissioners, when visiting a place in the West—in his (Mr. Blake's) constituency—used all his influence to induce an enumerator to vote for the one who was called the Government supporter, and that in consequence of having refused to do so was refused his appointment.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN had not the slightest knowledge of the matter.

Hon. Mr. DORION thought the officers who had been guilty of such interferences should be at once dismissed.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) said that the Hon. Mr. Dorion, when a candidate for Soulanges, had himself afterwards dismiss-

ed gentlemen who had refused to vote for him.

Hon. Mr. DORION denied the statement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that in Nova Scotia they were quite used to this sort of interference. At the first election for the Dominion the Customs officials had been expressly directed to vote for the Union candidate, and the same thing had been done in the late election for the Local Legislature,—and many officials had been removed for their voting wrongly,—and he was surprised therefore that those in Ontario should think so much of a single instance. He added that the Postmaster at Guysboro' had been dismissed for a similar reason. He also said that the enumerators recommended by the Halifax members had not been appointed, but those who were Government supporters were appointed in their place.

Mr. CAMPBELL dared the member for Halifax to state the real reason why the Postmaster at Guysboro' had been dismissed. It had no connection with the late election, but was for malpractices in connection with his office.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said he had received a telegram asking him to instruct the Customs officials to vote for the Union candidates at the time referred to, to which he had replied that he could in no way influence his officers, but should be pleased if they could see their way to vote for the Union candidates.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that in the case of the list of enumerators that had been sent in, referred to by the member for Halifax, it was found that the recommendations were entirely of partizans opposed to the Government, and all that had been done was that half the recommendations had not been acted on.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON said that it was well known how Government patronage was abused, and no one, who was in a Government position, had any right to interfere in election matters, unless they expected to be turned out of their offices on another Government coming into power. He was afraid they were fast verging towards the corrupt system existing in America.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that considering the Census appointments outside the usual Government patronage, he had made recommendations, which, in the majority of cases, had been carried out.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN had written the Minister of Agriculture to ask whether he desired any information or advice in the matter of the Census appointments, and had received the answer that though the

Minister would be delighted to receive any advice or information, he would not feel bound to act on it. He made similar complaints of officers being dismissed for their political action.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN replied as to the reason of the dismissals referred to.

The House went into Committee, and it being 12 o'clock, immediately rose and the House adjourned.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, April 3rd, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

ROUTINE.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, from the Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, reported the following Bills :

"An Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company," with amendments. The report was adopted, and the Bill read a third time.

"An Act to incorporate the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company, with amendments. The report was adopted, and the Bill read a third time.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN presented the eighth report of Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills. The Committee reported up the Bill respecting the incorporated village of Trenton with amendments.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN opposed the third reading of the Bill on the grounds that the Bill was of a local and private nature, and not cognizable by this Parliament under the British North America Act. He contended that subjects of such a nature were properly dealt with by the local legislature where members had a knowledge of the localities to which they applied, which was not the case when brought before Parliament.

The Bill was ordered to be printed and taken up for third reading on the following day.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL then rose and proposed the Resolutions providing for the admission of British Columbia into the Union with the following speech : In bringing the subject before the House, I am quite aware that hon. gentlemen have not only studied it, but have had an opportunity of hearing a great deal of discussion on the question in the House of Commons and reading many articles in the

Mr. Masson.

public press. Still, I think we may very well consider, before going into details, the general importance of the question and the magnitude of the interests involved in the passage of the resolutions. I do not for one moment shut my eyes to the amount of the undertaking which the Dominion will necessarily have to perform. But all those who took part in the original framing of Confederation—all those who have since given their acquiescence to the project—have constantly had before them this ulterior object, they have desired to see the Provinces and Colonies constituting British America united into one great country stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This is shown not only by the debates which took place at the Conference at Quebec but also in a direct and authoritative way by the resolutions which were the result of the conference. It is shown also by the language which is used in the British North America Act of 1867—the constitutional Act of this country at this time. From these facts it will be seen that the idea of developing her Majesty's dominions on this continent by the union of all British America, has been certainly kept in view. Both those who advocated union originally and those who have now on account of its adoption given their assent to it, have been and are still of the opinion that we should stretch our dominions across to the Pacific and endeavour to form one country under one Parliament, as the only way of maintaining on the continent those institutions and that form of Government which we believe to be the best calculated to promote our happiness and prosperity. It cannot, then, be denied that the admission of British Columbia is an essential part of the scheme of Confederation, and without it we could not look for the full development of the political, material and industrial advantages which are expected to result from the consolidation of the whole of the British American possessions under one Parliament and Government. I have noticed on several occasions that even those who occupy a very prominent position in another place, and have taken ground against these resolutions, have generally admitted that a railway is an essential part of the scheme, and that it should be built as soon as the resources of the country will permit. More than that, I have not read anywhere in the public press, during the last three months, during which the subject has been before the country, the statement of the proposition, that a Union with British Columbia is undesirable. Therefore, we may be allowed to assume that there is a prevalent sentiment throughout British America that the Union of all Brit-

ish America is desirable. Now, leaving the general question—the importance of the interests involved and the necessity of Union as respects the development of the resources of the Confederation, I may proceed to consider the terms on which the Union is to be effected. The general scheme involves three propositions which form the chief subjects of discussion. These propositions, on which grave doubts appear to have arisen in the minds of some gentlemen, refer to the representation of British Columbia, the nature of the financial arrangements apart from the railway, and the question of the railway itself. As respects the first, the question of representation, it has been objected that the scheme provides for a representation in Parliament beyond what we now enjoy in Canada. I suppose that almost every one, whatever his views may be, will agree that the rule of representation by population, cannot be fairly applied to a new territory. If we applied that rule to Manitoba, it would be left without any Parliamentary representation; and, therefore, it must be admitted that, in considering the case of a sparsely settled country, we must provide arbitrarily for the representation, as was done in the case of the new Province in the North West. We gave to Manitoba, with its population of 12,000, a representation of four members in the House of Commons, and of two representatives in the Senate; for we had to consider not merely the existing state of the country, but to look forward to the time, not far distant, when there would be a large and energetic population settled within its borders. This principle was affirmed by both Houses of the Parliament of Canada, as well as by the Government and Parliament of England. It was also affirmed with respect to Newfoundland, to whom we would have given a representation in advance of their population at the time; and, therefore, it was only just that we should apply the same rule to British Columbia. The population of that colony—supposing it to be as I stated it the other day—is composed of some 15,000 or 16,000 whites, some 1,000 Chinese, and 40,000 or 45,000 Indians. It is, however, a mistake to suppose that the Indian population is always left out in the consideration of the representation for the several Provinces. In the census which is now being taken the Indian population will be counted in every part of the Dominion, and will likely form an element in the adjustment of the representation. In the case of British Columbia, the ordinary rule respecting representation would have given her only one representative at the most, and no one can say that would satisfy her people. I think, too, we should bear in mind that that representa-

tion of six members will be the maximum until the next census.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Is there a minimum?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—That is the fixed number. We look forward to the time—as I am sure all must do—when there will be a large population in British Columbia, this representation will be found ten years hence to have been based on equitable principles. I now come to the second proposition, and that is the money arrangements outside of the railway. I do not apprehend, so far as I have been able to follow public opinion, that there has been any serious objection urged to these arrangements. It is certainly noteworthy that these resolutions were published in the newspapers three months ago, without evoking any opposition, or showing that they were framed contrary to public feeling. Honorable gentlemen, in considering the financial terms, must remember that it is not only necessary to take into account the amount granted, but the sum necessary to meet the necessities of British Columbia. It is proposed in these resolutions, to take from British Columbia, the revenue which she now derives from Customs, Excise, and port and harbour dues, which amounted, during the last year, to \$323,500, then there is the amount of postage which I put down at \$14,000; also the sum which is now derived from steamers, \$26,000. Upon the calculation which has been placed in my hand, and which I believe to be correct, the revenue derived from British Columbia will be \$363,500.

Hon. Mr. LETELLER DE ST. JUST—I see an item, page 9 of the return, in reference to the steamer *Douglas*.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—That item refers to the amount received for passenger traffic by a vessel called the *Douglas*, which is now being run for mail purposes, and which amount would to a certain extent accrue to the Dominion. In taking the Customs Duties, we must bear in mind that we obtain the most available and certain source of revenue to a new and sparsely settled country. On the other side of the account, we find the interest on the debt \$100,000; the subsidy in support of the Government \$35,000, and the amount of 80 cents per head of a population of 60,000—or \$48,000. An attempt has been made by an hon. friend of mine, who is in a position to form a good opinion of the probable charges of Governor, Judiciary, and Pensions list, and he puts it down at \$30,000. The expenses connected with the collection of customs may be estimated at \$15,000; mail, steam and telegraph department, \$63,800; light houses, \$9,500;

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

militia and geological surveys, \$25,000; hospitals \$10,000. The total of these amounts would give \$336,300 as the sum of the various charges against the Dominion. My hon. friend from St. John (Hon. Mr. Hazen), the other day, called attention to the guarantee for the dock at Esquimault. The amount which we are asked to guarantee, is \$100,000, which would be, at five per cent., \$25,000 for ten years. Adding this sum to the \$336,300, we have \$361,000.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—Is that strictly a guarantee, for which British Columbia will remain reliable?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is strictly a guarantee. I have already shown you that the amount we are to derive from British Columbia is \$363,500, and the amount we are to pay her, is \$361,000—a very insignificant difference certainly. In the latter amount, too, I have included the interest on the dock guarantee which cannot remain long a liability—that public work must pay at least the interest on the cost of construction, sooner or later. Now, I come to that item which provides that the Dominion Government agree to pay British Columbia the sum of \$100,000, in consideration of the land alongside the railway. It will be remembered that, in case of Newfoundland we agreed to give her \$150,000 per annum for land for ever. It was not believed in that case, nor is it in this, that the land would yield any revenue equal to that sum, but it was valuable in many respects, and it was felt necessary to assist Newfoundland beyond the 80 cents per head of population. Looking at the statement of the sums the Local Government of British Columbia will have to provide for, we find that it amounts to \$212,000—every item appears to be very carefully, even frugally considered. Then they have a British local revenue left them by the Dominion, put down at \$151,000. Assuming that the calculation of their expenses is very moderate, then we come to what they have to meet them. The 80 cents per head would be \$48,000; the subsidy would be \$35,000; the balance of interest on debt not incurred, \$25,000. That would give a total of \$259,000 against an actual existing expenditure of \$212,000 which is quite irrespective of the new Legislation and other kindred expenses which will in their new state devolve upon them. It must be remembered that in making an arrangement with a country like this, sparsely populated and with large boundaries, provision must be made for internal development and in any union we must make it satisfactory to the people of

that country as well as to ourselves. Looking, therefore, at the whole state of the case, there would only remain to British Columbia \$100,000, which we propose to give her for the land she agrees to cede to the Dominion on the line of railway. Surely that cannot be considered an unreasonable arrangement; in fact, I have not heard any one say so. In Ontario, it is expected that alternate sections of 20 miles will be given for the construction of the road whereas British Columbia gives a continuous grant of 20 miles on each side. Therefore, the quantity of land given by that colony is twofold, that to be given by Ontario and Manitoba. Therefore, the item respecting the land can be defended successfully with respect to the necessities and requirements of the country, and in a lesser degree by the cession of the land itself which the Dominion is to receive. We now come to the portion of the arrangement which the House, no doubt, considers the most serious feature, and that is the proposition for the construction of the railway. Reference has been made to the resolution of which notice has been given in another place. Now, I desire at the outset to call the attention of the House to the language of these resolutions before us, and show that it fully bears the interpretation which the notice in question gives to it. The language of these resolutions is not that the Government will build the railway themselves, but that Canada will *secure* the construction of it. They are not in any way bound to the mode of constructing the road which some gentlemen are so desirous of fastening upon us.

Hon. Mr. STEEVES—It points to the building of the road.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It points to the best mode of constructing the road.

Hon. Mr. SAMBORN—Perhaps the hon. gentleman will agree to incorporate the notice in question with the resolutions.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is impossible to do so, as I shall presently show; but in any case it is unnecessary. The resolutions, as originally framed, point to precisely the same thing the Government have always had in contemplation. The proposition to construct the road within a certain period has attracted a great deal of attention, but I may explain that we have mentioned that time as most likely to be occupied in the construction of the work. It was not intended that we should proceed again in the face of insuperable obstacles or jeopardize or injure the resources of the country. It must be remembered, too, that the people of British Columbia will stand hereafter precisely in the same position as we ourselves—their

representatives will be here and in the other branch, equally interested in the prosperity and economical administration of public affairs. We mentioned the time of 10 years as a guarantee that we were in earnest, and the intention has been always the same—the construction of the road by private enterprise and such aid as we could give without injuriously burdening the resources of Canada. Suppose a war arose in Europe to-morrow, and England became involved, would it be expected that we should nevertheless go on with the undertaking.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR—It would only put off the evil day.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It would only put off the fortunate day (hear). Every gentleman who has discussed this question has admitted that the road must be built sooner or later, and that British Columbia must come into the Union. Does any one hesitate to acknowledge the advantages which that colony will derive from the opening up of communications with this country? Not only will she be benefitted but the whole Dominion, by the opening up of rich territories which otherwise must be waste for very many years to come. We cannot be, ten years hence, in a better condition to deal with this question than we are now. Will the country be more fertile or our resources more capable of meeting the exigency? Never can it be in a better position to make a commencement in this matter. We all know the great interest that is taken by Great Britain in the progress of the Confederation, and the importance which the statesmen and people of that country attach to the extension of the system. It will not be denied—no one has attempted to do so—that until the railway is accomplished, no union will be perfect. In the plan proposed, certainly, there can be nothing to alarm hon. gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—What will be the cost?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I cannot tell my hon. friend, but I can tell him what will be the cost to this country, and that is the point for us to consider. What does my hon. friend know of the cost of railways heretofore?

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I know that when any similar scheme was laid before the country, we had reports of surveys and estimates of competent men to guide us, but we have no such facts before us in the present case.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—There will be a survey. I believe the expenditure for railways up to this time in this country has gone up as high as \$160,000,000. But

that is not the burthen imposed upon this country. If it had been said in 1854, when our railway system was commenced, that such a sum was to be expended in the construction of railways, the country might have been alarmed; but who now speaks of a very unnecessary burthen having been imposed upon the country in connection with these public works, which have proved so very beneficial to the country. Let us look back for a moment to the circumstances in which Canada stood at the time she incurred some of the large claims which have resulted so satisfactorily, and have placed us, in connection with other causes, in our present condition of prosperity. When we undertook our present Canal system, which has been very advantageous to the country, we had (in Ontario and Quebec) only a population of 1,100,000, and yet we entered upon the construction of public works which have cost \$16,000,000. Then, we had a debt of \$5,312,000 with a revenue of only \$1,280,000. Then, some years later, we embarked in the railway system, when we had only a population in the Canadas of 1,842,000, with a revenue of \$6,000,000, and a debt of \$20,000,000. At that time, we entered upon the construction of an expensive system of railways—assistance was given to some of these enterprises in various shapes. The result has been the construction of 3,000 miles of railway, involving an expenditure of \$160,000,000.

Hon. Mr. TESSIER—Was the prospectus of the Government promising ten per cent. realized?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—That prospectus was put forward by members of the then Government amongst others, but its statements have been more than realized as respects the earnings. The expenses of construction, however, were so much increased by the occurrence of the Russian War, and from other causes that the shareholders have sustained heavy losses. There can be no question, however, as to the soundness of the views which were then held by those who were dealing with public questions, with respect to the advantages which the road would confer upon the country at large. Similar results may reasonably be expected to accrue from the construction of the railway to the Pacific, on the terms on which we expect to have it accomplished. Now with respect to the mode in which this railway must be constructed. The resolutions say that "the Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years," and "to secure its completion within ten years from the date of Union."

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

Now supposing that plan be pursued, as proposed in the resolutions, the information we have been able to get from men competent to speak on the subject leads us to believe that the road can be built with the free grants and the aid of a small subsidy.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.—What will be the total amount of land?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.—The hon. member can easily make the necessary calculation.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.—The Government should be prepared with such information.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.—We must bear in mind that we have to build a railway, alongside of which the land is situated. We believe besides the land grant the Dominion need only give a subsidy ranging from \$7,000 to \$10,000 a mile, to accomplish the construction of the road. In the case of the Central Pacific, the Government of the United States gave a larger subsidy, some \$16,000 a mile, and in the Mountain country \$48,000 a mile. The Northern Pacific Railway, however, is being built without any money subsidy at all, and it runs through a country which, on the whole, is not so fertile as that which the Canadian Pacific will pass through. The sum I have mentioned will not bear hardly on the resources of the country, and should not cause us to be alarmed, especially when we come to review our past history. It will probably take from the present time to 1873 to survey the line. Then suppose we build 100 miles the first year, we will only have to pay \$50,000 interest on the subsidy; 200 miles the next would be \$100,000; 400 miles the interest on subsidy would be \$200,000, and so on until completion. The road is not to be built in a year, and our resources will not be burthened in any injurious or serious way.

But it is urged why not include the resolution, of which notice has been given elsewhere, in the present arrangement. It is unnecessary, in my opinion, but more than that, it would force us to send back the whole scheme to British Columbia, and open the door for other changes. Everybody who knows anything about the proceedings in that colony is aware that there were persons who required other stipulations than those embodied in the resolutions. They were told that the measure was in the nature of a treaty—I use that term for convenience—and they could not make changes in its details without sending it back here. We must endeavour to avoid all unnecessary delays in the accomplishment of this Union. And what possible benefit would be derived from the course proposed? It is not necessary to

make things really, but only apparently, clearer than they are now.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON—We must put that construction on the words which appear here.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is probably right as to the literal construction to be put on the resolutions.

Hon. Mr. STEEVES—Does my hon. friend wish to argue that hereafter the interpretation will not be given according to the words of the written document?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I do not think the literal meaning of the resolutions will be as hon. gentlemen desire to insist on, especially when they are coupled with the one to be passed in the other House—asking the authority of Parliament to construct the road by private enterprise and not by the Dominion. Nothing can be plainer than the language of this resolution: "Resolved, that the railway referred to in the address to Her Majesty concerning the Union of British Columbia with Canada, adopted by this House on Saturday the 1st April instant, *should be constructed and worked by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government*; and that the public aid to be given to secure that undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy in money, or other aid, not unduly pressing on the industry and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—That is not in your treaty.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It makes no difference whether it is in the treaty or not—it gives the real interpretation to the resolutions before us.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE—If that be the case, why not then send the matter back to British Columbia, and ask the Legislature to place the same interpretation upon it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—I have already shown you why that cannot be safely done. It must be remembered too that there are other interests besides of those of British connection—interests which would carry British Columbia in another direction.

Hon. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—What are they?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Every one knows perfectly well. The large sum of \$7,000,000 was readily given for the territory of Alaska, a country to the north of British Columbia, and by no means so rich in resources. Therefore it is necessary for the consolidation of British interests on this continent that we should not unnecessarily jeopardize the union of Canada with the colony on the Pacific shores. It is not as if we were making an arrangement

with a foreign country. The people of British Columbia will form a part of our population, and take the same interest in the affairs of the Dominion, that we do ourselves; and it is not likely, when she comes into the Union, she will wish to push this enterprize forward to the injury of the Dominion, with whose prosperity she will be so closely identified. This railway is not necessarily a British Columbia project, even if the colony were not to be united to Canada, they would have to open up a speedy communications with Manitoba and the North West. An ordinary road would not answer the purpose, but a railway would have to be built as soon as practicable—it was a part of our policy in annexing the North West. That fertile country would be little useful to Dominion unless it had speedy access to the markets of Canada and the United States. We must, therefore, consider the question in a Canadian point of view—in relation to the North West as well as to the Pacific colony. Without a railway no population will flow into the North West and we shall receive no advantages from our large territorial acquisition. I believe that this great work can be built with the grants of land and a money subsidy of about \$10,000 a mile. Every one agrees that the Union is necessary, and that the railway is an inevitable part of the scheme of Union; and all that is in dispute, is the best mode of constructing the road. I doubt if a more satisfactory mode can be proposed. I have not heard of any other having been suggested. If, then, we believe that the admission of British Columbia into Union with Canada is necessary, and that the railway is an essential feature of that Union; if we believe that the whole arrangement is necessary to the preservation of that British connection which has tended to make this country happy and prosperous, we should have no hesitation in passing the measure in its present shape. Our experience in the past shows us that we need not be apprehensive of the results that accrue from the construction of useful public works. In the present case the plan is so adjusted as to bear lightly on the resources of the country, which are in such rapid process of development from year to year (cheers.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, who followed in French, said that he must say at the outset that since Confederation was an accomplished fact, he was prepared to accept it, and make it as acceptable as possible to the people of the Dominion. He must, however, take strong ground immediately against the passage of the resolutions, as committing the House to a most dangerous financial policy. He had listened with much attention to

the remarks of the hon. Postmaster General, in the hope that he would be able to advance some legitimate argument before committing the House to a scheme of such a nature. He had heard with much surprise the Postmaster General advance as one of the reasons for dealing hastily with the question that if we did not unite now with British Columbia, she might ere long be lost to Canada and the Empire. He had no hesitation in saying that if the people of British Columbia were not loyal enough to enter the Confederation on reasonable terms, and were only to be bought at such an extravagant price as that mentioned in the resolutions, it would be far better for us not to have them at all in the Union. If they had not the courage to continue to be English subjects, they were not worth buying. If they did not wish to stay under the flag of England, except they are bought, he did not see the necessity or the use of forcing them and incurring such an immense expense for that purpose. The Hon. Postmaster General and another Minister in the House of Commons, had said that the conditions of Union embodied in the resolutions, were in the nature of a treaty, but that was no reason why this House should not be allowed to discuss and examine those terms, and why it should be called to pass them in such haste as the Government wanted it to do. If British Columbia wished to dictate terms, and such unreasonable terms to Canada, and not accept our own, we had far better refuse to receive her into our Union. The scheme which had been settled and agreed to between the delegates of British Columbia and our Ministers, seemed to him to be of a nature to involve us in such financial embarrassments as would ultimately lead us to bankruptcy. The Hon. Postmaster General had said that we would not be bound to construct the Pacific road with our money; but another Minister had said in another place that it would be constructed by the Government, and the resolutions themselves stated distinctly that it must be constructed in ten years from this, and it would cost at least \$100,000,000. The Hon. Receiver General (Mr. Chapais) had said that the means to be taken for its construction would be to grant 64 millions acres of land along the route, to private companies, who would also be aided by money grants from the Government, to the amount of seven or eight millions.

Hon. Mr. CHAPAIS explained that if the whole of the lands were given, they would amount to 64 million acres; but that if only alternate blocks of one mile were given to the company undertaking the construction of the road, the grant would

then amount to only half, or 32,000,000 acres.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that in that case, supposing all those lands could be sold at \$1 per acre, they would only realize 32 million dollars, and with seven or eight millions subsidy, the whole would only amount to 38 or 40 million dollars, and it was preposterous to think that any company would undertake the construction of such a road, the estimated cost of which was 100 million dollars, for such a grant. If we put such conditions to the construction of the road that no company would or could accept them, it would be far more honourable and straightforward not to make such promises as those contained in the resolutions. If we could judge of the probable cost of this Pacific Railway by that of the Intercolonial, which was only one-sixth its length and was going to cost from twenty to twenty five millions, if not more, we might safely assert that the Pacific would cost at least 150 millions. The Intercolonial passed through a well settled country for a good part of its length, and supplies and materials could be carried along its course by the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence, and then by the Bay of Chaleurs and the railroads of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, whilst there was no accommodation of the kind for the construction of the Pacific Railway; there was nothing but almost insuperable obstacles to its construction, and hence its cost would be infinitely greater per mile than that of the Intercolonial. It had been said, in order to commit the Senate in favour of the resolutions, that the road would not be constructed if it was found impossible to do it with the means mentioned, but this was only a dodge to blind the members of this House, and once committed to it, the Government would certainly go to enormous expense towards it, or else they would be playing a very dishonorable part with British Columbia, by promising what they did not intend to give. He thought that an undue influence had been brought to bear upon the members in favor of these resolutions, as had been the case last year with respect to another measure of the Government, which they wanted to pass against the wishes of a majority of this House. When opposition was offered to a measure of the Government in this House, it was said that the House had no right to counteract the financial policy of the Government, and an undue influence was brought to bear on some members to persuade them to vote for a measure which they disapproved. The same thing was being done in the present instance, and he must highly condemn such a course on the part of the Government, and claim the right for

Hon. Mr. Le Tellier de St. Just.

this House to discuss every question as freely and deliberately as the other House. The Senate ought to be perfectly independent of the Government; otherwise they would occupy a very undignified position before the country. The country had already signified its approval of the course of the Opposition last year, on the question of the odious tax imposed on coal and breadstuffs, which the Government carried in this House only by the questionable means to which he had already adverted, and he firmly believed that the country would also approve of his own and his friends, conduct towards this extravagant proposition of the Government. These propositions, as had been said by the Hon. Postmaster General, related to three different questions, that of representation, of finance, and the political question. With regard to the representation he (Hon. M. de Leteller) thought that the terms agreed to and granted to the people of British Columbia were very unfair for the rest of the Provinces, inasmuch as they gave six representatives to a population not larger than that of one of our large counties in Canada. The terms of the Confederation of the Provinces, settled at the Quebec Conference, were unjust for the Province of Quebec, inasmuch as its representation was to be forever fixed at a certain number, 65, whilst that of the other Provinces could be increased with the increase of their population, and he considered that the granting of six representatives to a population which is probably not over 10,000 whites—besides the 5,000 Chinamen and 45,000 Indians—was an aggravation of the injustice done to the Province of Quebec, as that representation was not at all based on the same proportion of population. It was true that the resolutions stated that the population of British Columbia was taken to be 60,000; and it had been said the number of whites was 16,000; but when we saw that neither the Lieutenant Governor nor any other authority could state exactly what that number was, nor on what basis the supposition of that number rested, it might safely be asserted that the real number of whites did not exceed 10,000. He repeated that the granting of six representatives to British Columbia was changing the base of the representation agreed to at the Quebec Conference, that it was an infringement on the rights of the Province of Quebec in particular, and that the representatives of that Province had therefore a perfect right, and it was moreover their duty, to oppose the resolutions. With regard to the financial question, he found that the Government had adopted a principle diametrically opposed to its declared policy, the same as for the basis

of the representation. We had seen the Government dismissing old servants of the late Province of Canada, and reducing the salaries of others, without any indemnity whatever; but by these resolutions they agreed to pensioning off and giving large salaries to the officers of the British Columbia Government. And reverting to the subject of the railway he asked whether any sensible and honest man would undertake to do what he knew he would not be able to accomplish with his present means, and whether a man in his private transactions, engaged in the construction of a work without first ascertaining its probable cost, or its ultimate value to him. The Government was now exactly in the position of a man who would thus act, for when he (hon. Mr. L.) asked the Postmaster General if he knew what the road would cost, or if its practicability had been ascertained, or if he could point out the means to construct it without increasing the burthen of taxation, the hon. gentleman could give no satisfactory answers to the questions. If the Hon. Postmaster General was to apply such a principle to the administration of his private affairs he would probably soon find that it was a dangerous principle, a principle that would soon bring him to bankruptcy and ruin. With regard to the political question, whilst thinking that the Union of British Columbia with Canada might be acceptable and desirable if it could be accomplished on reasonable terms, he did not believe that it ought to be paid for at such a price as that laid down in the resolutions. As it was, it might be said that British Columbia dictated the terms of Union, and that she actually annexed Canada to her. He concluded by condemning the Government for refusing to help the construction of the North Shore Railway, which would be beneficial to a large portion of the people and the trade of Canada, when they are ready to expend hundreds of millions of dollars on a railway in a barren and mountainous country, without first ascertaining its practicability, and which cannot pay its working expenses. He moved in amendment that, after "3 resolved" insert, "that in the opinion of this House, the further consideration of this question be postponed for the present session of Parliament, in order that greater and more careful consideration may be given to a question of such magnitude and importance to the people of this Dominion."

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said—In rising to second the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, I may say at the outset that I am in no way indisposed to carry out the policy involved in the Act for the union of British America, and to bring British Columbia into the Union. What I say is that

if the Government embody in these resolutions any stipulations like that which is contained in the resolution, of which notice has been given in the House of Commons, then a great many of my objections would vanish. We have already annexed the North West Territory, and, as one member of the House, I have been quite prepared to spend money in opening up communications with that country, knowing that otherwise it would remain a burthen on the Dominion. I am also quite prepared to give what is proposed in these resolutions to British Columbia, knowing that Canada is not likely to derive any revenue from that colony for a length of time equal to its expenditure. But when I read the paragraph relative to the construction of the Pacific Railway, I certainly feel that I am not prepared to give my vote in favour of propositions for the building of 2,500 or 2,700 miles of a road, of the expense of which we have no definite facts before us—of which no explorations or surveys have been made, and when throughout the whole extent, including the Red River and British Columbia, there are only some 25,000 white inhabitants. We have already in the Confederation Act made provision for the construction of an Intercolonial Railway: The wisdom of Parliament has decided that that road shall be built through a part of New Brunswick at a much greater expense than if built in another direction. The same Act has provided that as soon as the finances of the country will permit, the canals should be enlarged. The cost of the railway will be, at least, \$20,000,000; the cost of canal improvements probably \$30,000,000. The estimated cost of the Pacific Railway will be something like \$100,000,000; and certainly, when I come to consider the population, resources, and existing engagements of Canada, such a scheme seems to mean simply bankruptcy. Experience is the great teacher, and tells us what has happened when prudence has taken wings and reckless enterprize has taken its place. In Allison's history of Europe I find the following description of the railway mania that occurred in Great Britain during the years 1844-45-46:

"The first effect of this state of things, as auspicious in the outset as it was perilous in the end, was a vast increase in railway speculation, and the growth of what has not inaptly been called the Railway Mania. It was during the years 1844, 1845, and 1846 that this system received its full development, and it was then pushed to a degree of extravagance which would not be credited by future times if not attested by a host of contemporary witnesses and evinced by lasting effects upon the face and fortunes of the country. Compared with the fever which then seized the public mind, and the magnitude of the speculations in consequence set afloat, the famous South Sea Bubble, and the corresponding fervour of England in 1821-25 and 1836-37, sink into insignificance. * * * * It would be well if the historian

had only to record the immediate losses which arose to parties concerned in them from these gigantic undertakings; but, unfortunately, the evil did not stop here, but, on the contrary, has impressed its mark in a lasting way on the national character, and on the estimation in which the Legislature is held."

There you have an illustration of the way in which money was recklessly spent. Surely this House is not prepared to forget dictates of sound judgment and countenance a policy which, if carried out within 10 years as provided for in the resolutions, must involve the Dominion in inextricable embarrassment. The Postmaster General says that it is not the intention of the Government to burthen the country, and adds that the Dominion is not to build the railway, but why do they not state the facts clearly and explicitly in the resolutions—or that we are prepared to give certain moneys and lands—facilities for the construction of the road, and nothing more. What has been done in the past may happen in the future. We have alongside of us a very enterprising people, but let us see what history records with respect to their extravagance and rash speculation in railway and other matters during a period of their history.

"The humble petition of the Rev. Sydney Smith to the honorable House of Congress at Washington.

"I petition your honorable House to institute some measures for the restoration of American Credit, and for the repayment of debts incurred and repudiated by several of the States. Your petitioner lent the State of Pennsylvania a sum of money for the purpose of some public improvement. The amount, though small, is to him important, and is a saving from a life income, made with difficulty and privation. If their refusal to pay (from which a very large number of English families are suffering) had been the result of war produced by the unjust aggression of powerful enemies—if it had arisen from civil discord—if it had proceeded from an improvident application of means in the first years of self-government—if it were the act of a poor State struggling against the barrenness of nature—every friend of America would have been contented to wait for better times; but the fraud is committed in the proud place of Pennsylvania, by the richest State in the Union, after the wise investment of the borrowed money in roads every day reaping the advantage. It is an act of bad faith which (all its circumstances considered) has no parallel and no excuse.

Nor is it only the loss of property which your petitioner laments still more than immense power which the bad faith of America has given to aristocratical opinions and to the enemies of free institutions in the Old World. It is in vain any longer to appeal to history and to point out the wrongs which the many have received from the few. The Americans, who boast to have improved the institutions of the Old World, have at least equalled its crimes. A great nation after trampling under foot all earthly tyranny has been guilty of a fraud as enormous as ever disgraced the worst king of the most degraded nation of Europe.

"It is painful to your petitioner to see that American citizens excite, wherever they may go, the recollection that they belong to a dishonest people, who pride themselves upon having tricked and having pillaged Europe; and this mark has been fixed, by their faithless legislators, on the best and most honorable men in the world, whom every Englishman has been eager to see and proud to receive."

What I urge is that we should count the

Hon. Mr. Wilmot.

cost before we enter into this arrangement. We are here, as men of business experience, to deal with the question calmly and practically, and not to be carried away by false enthusiasm or dreams of the imagination. I ask any hon. gentleman in this House if it is possible for us, with our present means, to make ourselves responsible for so enormous an obligation as the building of this road will entail on us. Whatever the House may do, I must enter my protest against such a suicidal policy. We have already had a little experience in the way of railway construction. I have been a member of a Committee formed, on the motion of my hon. friend to the left (Hon. Mr. Wark) to enquire into matters connected with the Intercolonial Railway. I have seen that the expenditure on that road, in connection with surveys alone, has amounted to \$1,200 a mile—any railway engineer, who understood his business, would perform the same work for \$500 a mile; and I give this as one instance of the nature of Government Railway works—just what the Pacific Railway may be, and in what manner they are managed in this country. Before we rush blindly into these expenditures, we should consider all the facts before us, and should not allow ourselves to be carried away by purely imaginative schemes, certain to end in national disaster. We have had some experience in New Brunswick with respect to the construction of railways. The hon. member from St. John (Hon. Mr. Hazen) and myself were members of a Government who entered into a contract with an English firm, of which the late Mr. Brassey was a member to build a railway from St. John to Shediac, and westerly to the American boundary. The Province agreed to take £1,200 stock per mile in the Company, and advance as a first mortgage £1,800 more—altogether £3,000 per mile. Unfortunately, for the country, that Government (laughter) was displaced, and my hon. friend in front of me (Hon. Mr. Mitchell) was a member of the administration that succeeded. They thought that the road could be built for a smaller sum, and they agreed to buy out the English Company for £90,000 Sterling. The eventual result was that the road cost \$43,500 a mile, cash paid, instead of a charge on the Province as was originally contemplated of \$12,000 per mile. Then the Province of New Brunswick adopted a different policy—they agreed to give a subsidy of \$10,000 per mile for certain roads to be built within the Province. Under that Act, several railways were built and completed ("hear" from Government benches); and now, had the Dominion Government come down with a definite proposition to give a

subsidy, of so much a mile, to any Company which would be willing to construct the work supplemented by a grant of land, I would have been prepared to support it, instead of being compelled in the interests of the people of the Dominion to vote against it; for according to its liberal construction, we must pledge the country to enormous expenditures beyond what it is able to bear. I do not wish to see this country placed in the humiliating position of possibly repudiating its sacred obligations; and, therefore, I feel bound to take a position on this question which is reconcilable with my sense of public duty.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said that although he would differ from the hon. Members who had preceded him in the vote he would give on the question under debate, there were some sentiments in the speeches of his hon. friends in which he unreservedly agreed. He agreed with the hon. member from Grandville in the magnitude and importance of the subject under consideration—the great scope for inquiry and discussion it afforded—the vast national aspects it presented, and the grave responsibilities involved in the motion before the House. But he had no sympathy with the general tone of that hon. gentleman's speech; he could not, in many instances, see the force of his arguments, or admit the correctness of his conclusions; he could not certainly share in the gloomy forebodings which his hon. friends had indulged in, or in their want of faith in the ability of this Dominion to accomplish the great work on which it had entered. Nor did he believe the views of these hon. members would find favor with a majority of that House or the country. On the contrary, that Parliament would prove itself equal to its high duties on the present occasion, as it had done on occasions of a similar character—as it had done in dealing with Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and Manitoba, he had every hope and confidence. Such too he believed to be the wish and expectation of the great majority of the people of this Dominion. There was a doctrine prevalent among their Republican neighbours, the doctrine of "manifest destiny," the meaning of which was familiar to all, and the attainment of which was frequently advocated on the principle that the end justified the means. That doctrine looked to the absorption, by that great power, of all the territory of this Continent, either by force or diplomacy, or in any other way in which it could be achieved. He could not help thinking that they too should have their manifest destiny; a destiny, however, not of wrong or aggression, or of self-aggrandizement at the expense of their neighbours, but a juster and a nobler

one. Theirs should be a destiny of enlightened progress—a destiny to take advantage of the elements of future prosperity and greatness, of right belonging to them, and so profusely within their reach, by uniting and consolidating in one harmonious whole, the magnificent possessions of their Sovereign in British North America (cheers.) That he believed to be the destiny of the Dominion, and it was one alike worthy of their highest ambition and within their ability and reach. He was aware there were some among them with whom these views might excite derision; there were some who sneered at what they called the pretensions of this great young nation, and who were always ready to belittle its present status and deride and doubt its ultimate success. Those, he felt sure, were a small minority, daily growing "smaller by degrees and beautifully less." He was unprepared for the views expressed in some quarters on the question before the House; he was especially surprised at the expressions of his hon. friend from St. John, (Hon. Mr. Hazen), whose great ability and large Parliamentary experience gave authority and weight to anything he said, when he declared that because he was an opponent of Confederation from the beginning, he, as a member of this Parliament, refused to assume any responsibility on this question (hear, hear). That hon. gentleman desired to throw on the originators of union all the odium of its results, while willing to take all its benefits. But he was content to assume all that responsibility and defend the policy of union. So far, it must be admitted, the Confederacy had proved a great success—had proved at least equal to all its higher obligations of a national character, and the experience of the past might reasonably make them hopeful of the future. He said this in no party sense and with no reference to many acts of administration of which he disapproved. When he spoke of the higher national obligations of the Dominion, he alluded to those things above the ordinary duties of internal administration, which it was the especial mission of Confederation to achieve. First among these was its duty to effect the union under one government of every square mile of British North American soil. In dealing with Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Manitoba, Parliament had exhibited a degree of wisdom and generosity that elicited admiration at home and abroad, and although the Island Colonies had not thrown in their lot with them, there was little doubt they would not much longer hesitate to do so. In both places, a counter action had already set in; prejudice and passion were rapidly disappearing before the light of truth and

Hon. Mr. Wilmot.

reason: faction was fast losing its hold and influence; the disadvantages of isolation were daily becoming more apparent; the terms offered were being more calmly discussed, and their liberality more generally admitted (cheers). Then again, in protecting their invaluable fishery rights against foreign encroachments; in repelling on more than one occasion hostile invasions of their soil, in allaying discontent in Nova Scotia, in quelling insurrection in the North West and establishing order and constitutional government where confusion and anarchy prevailed, in doing those things, which were amongst the first cares of a national existence, the Dominion, almost unaided, had proved equal to its duty (cheers.) The progress so far and the results achieved, were satisfactory. The vast territories of the Hudson's Bay Company, so long shut against colonization and settlement had been added to the Union, which now extended from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains. They had already secured a territory out of which many splendid colonies would yet be formed, and that would offer an inviting home to millions. Who doubted that soon the tide of immigration would set towards those fertile regions, and that ere long they would see the whole country from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains, with cheap and certain and quick communication, occupied by a prosperous population, contributing to the strength and wealth of the Dominion? Yet even a few years ago, how remote did what had already been accomplished appear even to the most sanguine? A few years ago the people of the Maritime Provinces took less interest in the affairs of old Canada than they did to day in the affairs of Manitoba; it was not long since Montreal appeared more distant to them than Winnipeg then did. It was one of the happiest results of Confederation, that through it, the inhabitants of the Old Provinces were brought into familiar intercourse with each other, by which many groundless sectional jealousies and local prejudices had been removed, and a truer understanding of their common interests secured. A diversity of wants and interests had, in many cases, proved a bond of unity, showing them to be dependent upon, and necessary to each other (cheers). It was true, they had not arrived at a political millenium in which sectional narrowness and faction had altogether given way to a sense of public duty—such could not be expected, and such was not the case. But among its substantial advantages, the result of Confederation had also been to elevate the tone of public sentiment; to enlarge the views of the people and their representatives; to educate them all up to the duties of their advanced growth, and

to infuse a courage and spirit of self-reliance in regard to whatever remained to be done in the accomplishment of their manifest destiny (cheers.) Such were the political results of Union; its results on the material prosperity of the people of every section of the Dominion were equally gratifying. Accustomed in their several Provinces, before that event to deal only with local subjects comparatively small and unimposing, they perhaps required the education the larger arena of this Parliament afforded to enable them to deal hopefully and fearlessly with a subject of the magnitude of that under consideration. He believed this question would now be approached in no timid or narrow spirit. He thought that no time should be lost—that no exertions should be spared, to secure the admission into the Union of British Columbia on the one side, and Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland on the other. Under these circumstances, and at a most auspicious time, the application of British Columbia to become part of the Dominion of Canada was submitted to this Parliament. In considering that application, he would trespass on the patience of the House to take a rapid glance at the country, its value and resources, they were about to secure by the proposed arrangement. British Columbia, including Vancouver's Island, as they were all well aware, was the most western dependency of England on this continent. It comprised a territory of about 290,000 square miles, situated, with the exception of a small portion of Vancouver's Island, above the parallel of 49° N. Lat. It possessed a sea-coast of about 500 miles, as settled by the Treaty of Washington in 1846, and a breadth of between 300 and 400 miles. The country, although in many parts broken and uneven, contained much valuable agricultural land, equal to the support of a great population. The climate is admitted to be one of the most desirable in the world for natives of the temperate zones, and they would all admit the importance of climate in inducing immigration. "A dry, warm summer; a bright, beautiful autumn; an open, wet winter and spring"—is said to be a true description of the weather in Vancouver's Island, and all along the sea coast of British Columbia. Only an imperfect estimate can be formed of its population, as no census has ever yet been taken, but from the best sources of information available the population, consisting of Whites, Indians, and Chinese, may be put down at 60,000. A few years after the treaty of Washington, Vancouver's Island was granted by the Crown to the Hudson's Bay Company under conditions of settlement which were never complied with, the object of that Corporation being there as

elsewhere to retard settlement wherever their monopoly extended. These causes, coupled with its recent settlement, will account for its small population. But its great resources, and unrivalled maritime advantages, must before long make it one of the most thriving and important communities on the Pacific. Those resources were very numerous. There was its timber, especially its pine, universally conceded to be the best in the world, and as exhaustless as it was superior. Markets for this commodity on both sides of the Pacific were abundant, and writers well acquainted with the subject contend that the investment of capital and labour in that branch of industry alone would soon make the country populous and wealthy. The prosecution of this business on a large scale would soon call into existence a large mercantile marine, for timber being a bulky commodity required a large tonnage for transportation. It was this industry alone that had made New Brunswick second only to Nova Scotia in the tonnage it possessed (hear, hear). British Columbia is known to contain coal formations of immense extent. They need not be told of the value of coal as a source of national wealth: it was one of the first requisites of manufacturing success, and one of the chief elements of general commercial prosperity. Its coal alone would make British Columbia a valuable acquisition even to a country not requiring a Pacific seaboard. The demand for coal in the North Pacific was said to be very great, and the full development of that rich resource could not be much longer retarded. Coal also being a bulky article would give employment to a large number of ships, thereby encouraging ship building, and bringing into existence a large amount of tonnage. His hon. friends from Nova Scotia would admit what the coal trade of that Province had done to make them the largest ship owning community in the world in proportion to population (hear, hear). Then copper abounded in the colony, and also magnetic iron ore, marble, limestone, sandstone, &c. Its gold fields had a world-wide reputation. The export of that precious metal had been computed in some years to exceed \$4,000,000. Its fisheries were almost equal to their own, and are destined to become an important item of commerce. The people of California, Mexico, and those countries on the west coast of South America, would be larger consumers of that article than Spain, Italy, and the Brazils, which now afforded to the Atlantic Provinces so large a market. Besides, no place on this continent was better situated for the prosecution of the whale and seal

fisheries than British Columbia. This was another branch of industrial wealth that would tend toward the building up of that favoured colony as a Maritime State, ultimately destined to compete for the carrying trade of the Pacific, especially between Asia and America (hear, hear). It was here worthy of remark that while the prosperity of Nova Scotia depended largely on its coal and fish, that of New Brunswick chiefly upon its lumber, that of Newfoundland wholly on its fish, British Columbia combined all these elements of wealth, and many more, the possession of which had ever been a source of national prosperity (hear, hear). But great as may be the resources of that colony, and desirable as would be its acquisition for the sake of those resources, it was as a Pacific sea-board that British Columbia was invaluable to the Dominion and the Empire. What would not the United States give for its possession in order to shut out Canada and Britain from the possibility of becoming their rivals in the trade and commerce of the Pacific? A very few years ago an able writer in the California press spoke thus of the coming struggle between these two countries for "the trade of the East, and the empire of the seas":—

"That England has great purposes to effect in this part of the world, is, no doubt true; that she has grand projects on foot, looking to a Union of her North American Colonies, and the opening of a highway from ocean to ocean, she does not seek to disguise. That these new settlements are yet to become competitors for the trade of the east, if not for the commercial supremacy of the Pacific, it were useless to deny. * * * But, however, we may regard the advent of England upon our shores, or whatever estimate we may set on the value of her possessions in this quarter, one thing is certain, we have now got to meet her on this side of the globe as we have met her on the other; and encountering her enterprise and capital, her practical, patient industry and persistence of purpose, dispute with her for the trade of the east and the empire of the seas."

When intelligent foreigners were so early alive to the inevitable rivalry here indicated, was it not time that they should be awake to their duty and interests? England still maintained her supremacy on the ocean, daily distancing all her rivals. But may not even they, one of England's dependencies, venture to dispute the empire of the seas with their ambitious neighbours? When the Dominion controls 500 miles of sea-coast on the Pacific, and more than double that extent on the Atlantic, with natural resources and commercial necessities to call into existence a mercantile marine; with the greatest facilities in the world for ship building, and a policy removing all restrictions and taxation from that enterprise, who could doubt the result? He recollected reading last year in a leading commercial journal of New York an able review of this subject, in which the writer predicted with regret,

that the Dominion of Canada, already third or fourth on the list of maritime States, would in the beginning of the next century be the greatest maritime power on the Globe (cheers). Such being the value and advantage of the territory proposed to be annexed to this country, the question arose whether in view of the policy to which the Dominion was committed, and the absolute necessity, politically and commercially, of securing a sea board on the Pacific, they were asked to pay too high a price for their object. He did not think there could be much dissatisfaction with the general terms of the arrangement; the only real objection was to the great outlay in connexion with the Pacific Railway. Passing over for the present the subject of the railway, it did not appear to him that the terms agreed on, although certainly liberal as they ought to be, contained anything unreasonable. He did not think there was anything to complain of in fixing the population at 60,000, even if it were something less. The financial arrangements had, doubtless, been settled on accurate information, and a full investigation of the wants and circumstances of the colony. If the present tariff of British Columbia was continued, the Dominion would lose nothing, but allowing for a change to the tariff of Canada after Union, which was in the option of the Local Legislature and, no doubt, would be made, still if the country became at all populated they would lose nothing. The public works and services stipulated to be undertaken appeared proper and necessary. Neither did he consider that any alarm need be felt from giving to British Columbia a larger representation in the Senate and House of Commons than its present population would justify. The same compromise had been extended, although not to the same extent, to Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Manitoba. But the population would soon become equal to the representation, which in 1881 would be arranged on the basis of the British North America Act. There was nothing to fear from the presence, temporarily, of two or three more members in this Parliament either from British Columbia or Manitoba than they were at present strictly entitled to; they could not unfairly influence the decision of Parliament (hear, hear). It could not be denied the great stumbling-block in the negotiations submitted to Parliament for approval was the gigantic undertaking to connect the Pacific with the Atlantic by railway, a work estimated to require over \$100,000,000. To look at this great project simply as a portion of the terms offered to secure the admission of British Columbia into the Union, was

Hon. Mr. Miller.

not viewing it in a fair light. True the undertaking was now assumed in connection with the terms agreed upon with that colony, but it was because it could not sooner be assumed—it could not be contemplated while British Columbia remained out of the Union, and Canada had no seaboard on the Pacific. It was absurd—it was purely factious, to look upon this great national highway simply as a British Columbian affair; it was subject alike of Dominion and Imperial interest. It was equally absurd to say they were asked to build this railway to secure the annexation of that colony. The reverse of that proposition was nearer the truth. The railway was to be built because it had become practicable by the agreement of British Columbia to join the Union, thereby giving the Dominion control of all the country between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans required for its construction. There could be little doubt that they possessed the country that afforded the best route for an interoceanic railway.

(Mr. Miller here cited various authorities to show the feasibility of a railway across British territory—its advantages over every other line that could be built on the continent—its prospects of becoming the highway for traffic and travel between Europe and Asia, and also showing how this means of communication had hitherto been neglected, partly in consequence of the efforts to find a water communication between the two oceans through the North West passage, forever abandoned for all practical purposes).

It could not be denied, however that the proposition to build this railway would startle the most reckless, if it meant to tax the people of this country to the extent of \$100,000,000 for such a purpose (hear, hear). No public man among them would dream of anything so visionary and impossible as that of doubling the debt of the Dominion for this single undertaking within the next ten years. Canada, in agreeing to secure the construction of this railway, meant nothing of the kind. It was not necessary and could not be expected from them; they would be required he felt confident to do only their fair share. A railway across the continent on British soil was as much an Imperial as a Dominion necessity. There was no doubt that England so regarded it. The leading minds of the Empire had unmistakably given their opinion on the high national character of the work. From among a host of others, he would quote Lord Bury, who had given much attention to this subject, and who, some years ago, before the construction of the American Pacific Railway, the completion of which had given double force to his language, said :

"Our trade in the Pacific Ocean with China and with India, must ultimately be carried on through our North American possessions; at any rate our political and commercial supremacy will have utterly departed from us if we neglect that very great and important consideration, and if we fail to carry out, to its fullest extent, the principal advantages which the country offers to us and which we have only to stretch out our hands to take advantage of."

Perhaps there never was a time when political reasons rendered the completion of this great inter-oceanic highway so important to England. If "the signs of the times" could be relied on, at no distant day, her supremacy, it maintained at all, as he hoped it would be maintained, will be maintained after a desperate struggle. In that event, what would be the whole cost of this road to the advantages it would afford, and the treasure it would save the Empire? Can it be supposed that British Statesmen are not alive to these considerations, and what has money ever been to England when her honour, her interests, or her power has been concerned? That when the time came, England would do her duty, and do it generously, in this great national enterprise, they might safely believe. The importance of this railway is strongly put in an article published some time ago in the *Money Market Review*, from which he would read an extract :—

"That under these circumstances the railway will be made, sooner or later, there can be no doubt. With interests so numerous, so vast, and with such means at command, the difficulty of constructing this Hudson's Bay Railway ought to assume the most moderate proportions. Great Britain, Europe, Canada, British Columbia, New Zealand, Australia, the Hudson's Bay Company, and the International Financial Society, all want the Railway, and would gain by the Railway, and it would be amazing, if with such interests and such resources, it could not be made and made properly. In India, State guarantees had been given, and are promised upon Railway capital, sufficient to construct this line ten times over; and it is a question whether any one Indian Railway is more useful than this even for state purposes."

The certainty of England assisting, either by guarantee or otherwise, in this great work being clear, what he asked was the true position of the people of Canada regarding it? They had lately acquired the North West as far as the Rocky Mountains. Unless certain, and quick communication with that territory could be afforded, immigrants could not be expected to go there; the country would remain unsettled, and instead of being a source of wealth, would continue a burden on the Dominion. They could not shirk their duty with regard to that great extent of country, unless they were willing to admit that they, four millions of the descendants of the hirsute races that in modern times had led the civilization of the world, were as unequal to its government as the blighting monopoly

they had superceded (hear, hear). That country was comparatively valueless, unless connected with the rest of the Dominion by railway. Therefore, they would be obliged, as the Postmaster General had correctly said, to construct the greater portion of the Pacific Railway in order to open up and colonize that newly acquired territory, although British Columbia remained out of the Union. But in this view the work would not be looked upon as a work of Imperial interest, deserving Imperial aid. By uniting British Columbia and starting the railway as a work of national necessity; as a work of the highest Imperial concern, it would secure the countenance and assistance of the Empire. If Canada could secure a fair measure of Imperial support, the rest was certainly within her means. They had at their disposal limitless quantities of rich lands, the value of which would be greatly enhanced by this railway.

(Here Mr. Miller showed the extent and value of the land at the disposal of the Government to construct the railway, the advantages of the country over the line of the American Pacific Railway, the probability that only a very small subsidy from the Government would be required, which would be rendered smaller by the probable guarantee of the Imperial Government, making the proposed liability a very different thing from what it was represented to be by the opponents of the measure).

It may be said, that it was unwise to bind themselves to the completion of this work within ten years. But they saw more changes, more great results achieved, in a decade now, than in a century a hundred years ago; to make the time longer would look like not being in earnest, and he trusted the Government were in earnest in this great work. It had also been said that the Maritime Provinces had no interest in the union of British Columbia and the construction of the railway. He repudiated on behalf of the Province he represented, an idea so narrow and sectional (hear, hear). Whatever benefited any portion of this Dominion, benefited every portion of it (cheers.) The people of Nova Scotia were as much interested in the perfection of your canal system as the people of Ontario. They should not be told that because no portion of this road was required to be built in Nova Scotia, they had no interest in it. As the wharf of this Dominion, Nova Scotia had an interest in everything that tended to develop the great territory of British America behind it. Nova Scotia was as much interested as Vancouver island in the completion of the inter-oceanic railway, and would benefit as much from it (hear,

Hon. Mr. Miller.

hear). Halifax might, after this road was built, look forward to become the great Atlantic depot of the trade of the East—a trade that had enriched, in ancient and modern times, every country that had possessed it. The author of an able work of this subject spoke of this trade and its advantages to those that had ever secured it in this way.

“Control of trade with the east has been coveted as a prime source of wealth by western nations from the remotest antiquity. Mercantile communities engaged from age to age in carrying eastern freight, have invariably prospered from the undertaking, and the grandest cities of ancient and modern times, have owed much of their splendor to the fact of this rich traffic passing through them. The Tyrians, Greeks, Romans, Saracens, Venetians, Portuguese, Dutch, and English afford monumental proof of these statements.”

He trusted that before many years the Dominion of Canada would furnish another monumental proof of the statement of that writer. He believed, with the completion of railway communication between the Atlantic and Pacific, Nova Scotia would occupy one of the proudest and most prosperous positions in North America, and that the realization of this scheme presented to that Province a future that the imagination could not exaggerate. If Nova Scotia were disposed to be selfish and sectional—if its people were unfit to take a broad national view of a great subject affecting the whole country—he would still, on the most selfish and sectional considerations as a representative of that Province, advocate the construction of this railway. If they could secure for this line the trade of the East; if Halifax, with its harbour capable of accommodating the shipping of all the world, were to become the Atlantic depot of that trade, what dream could exaggerate the future wealth and greatness that were in store for it (cheers)? In concluding his observations, he could not help remarking on a coincidence in his own connexion with the great question of Confederation, which the House would pardon him for referring to. On this day five years, he had by his action and his utterances in the Legislature of his native Province, marked an epoch in its history, well in the recollection of many who listened to him (hear, hear). On this very day five years ago, he had, in the Assembly of Nova Scotia, when making an important motion regarding Confederation, said that “a union of the Maritime Provinces with Canada and the great country beyond would give them a territory extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with all the diversified resources necessary to the most unlimited material progress.” He little imagined on that day that exactly five years afterwards he would be called upon in the Parliament of this Dominion to raise

his humble voice, and give his humble vote in favour of the great project he then desired to see accomplished. Through good report and through evil report, through obloquy and mis-representation, the loss of friends and the sacrifice of popularity and personal advantages, he had never doubted the wisdom of the course he had on that day adopted, or regretted it. In their political horizon he saw no sign to warrant despondency or regret, but in the present position and prospects of this country, he saw much room for hope, much reason for gratitude, and much cause for honest pride (hear, hear). The friends of union had nothing to regret or to be ashamed of, and he trusted the day was not far distant when, by the admission of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, the people of the Dominion would be called upon to celebrate the completion of the noble edifice of British North American Union (prolonged cheers).

Hon. Mr. SANBORN—One cannot fail to admire the enthusiasm which has characterized the speech of the hon. member who had just sat down. When I recall his remarks I cannot help thinking of an observation once made by the late Lord Elgin, that a Yankee would not be content with the Garden of Eden but would go Westward. I think if the hon. member lives to see his aspirations realized, and this inter-oceanic railway extended to the Pacific, he will feel, as Alexander of old, when he wept because there were no more worlds for him to conquer; for he will have come to the waters of the Pacific and there is no more land westward for him to annex. The subject now before us presents itself in three aspects: First, the propriety of the union of British Columbia; secondly, the mode of union; and thirdly, the financial arrangement by which that union is to be obtained. I will address myself first to the second proposition, because it is the one most easy to dispose of. I am now referring to the constitutional aspect of the question as it presents itself to my mind. When the Bill with respect to Manitoba was before us last year, I doubted the constitutionality of our proceedings at the time. It seems to me that the Government have been all the time taking an erroneous course. They failed to ask for an address in the case of Rupert's Land, whereas now they adopt that mode. But I see a difficulty connected with this question. There is a stipulation in the British North America Act which does not enable us to proceed simply by address for the purpose of admitting British Columbia into the Union. The 146th clause is as follows: "It should be lawful for the Queen, by and with the

advice of Her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or Provinces, or any of them, into the Union; and on address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's land and the North Western territory, or either of them into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf, shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." Now, to my mind, we will only be able to admit British Columbia on the terms of the Imperial Act. Then, I find in the next clause the following with respect to the appointment of Senators: "In case of the admission of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, or either of them, each shall be entitled to a representation in the Senate of Canada of four members and (notwithstanding anything in this Act) in case of the admission of Newfoundland, their normal number of Senators shall be seventy-six and their maximum number shall be eighty two, &c." I find no provision whatever in the Act for the appointment of Senators from British Columbia, and when this address is carried before the Queen in Council, it will be impossible to name the Senators without an Imperial Statute. Here the maximum number of Senators is fixed at 82 after the admission of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and there is no mention whatever of any power given to appoint Senators for British Columbia. In the next place, with respect to the representation, referring to the sections of the British North America Act, we find a certain number provided for a certain population—a certain number for Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, according to population. This representation is to be increased on certain conditions. A certain proportional rate in Quebec is to fix the rate in the other Provinces. Under the present arrangements six representatives are given to British Columbia in the House of Commons. This is in direct contravention of the Constitution and destroys the equilibrium which was established in the Act. I now come to consider the propriety of the admission of British Columbia. I have not had the good fortune—if it is a good fortune—to have been among those who were instrumental in assisting in the infancy of Confederation. However, if all

the brilliant prospects depicted by the hon. member are to be realized—if we are to become that great nation of which we are told; then I rejoice that we are getting along so well, though I have not had the honour of participating in the inauguration of the scheme, and I shall rejoice to be so agreeably disappointed. After this Confederation became an accomplished fact, I declared that I was prepared to accept it and do all in my power to strengthen it. I still entertain these sentiments, and desire to express them unreservedly. I am prepared to admit that we looked forward to the admission of British Columbia as a part of the Confederation scheme, and perhaps communication with the Pacific by means of an interoceanic Railway. But whilst I make this statement in good faith and wish most earnestly to see this country built up and strengthened I am not prepared to wander blindly into schemes which, in my judgment, we are not capable of carrying out. British Columbia was expected to come into Confederation, but it must be remembered that in accomplishing this union there were other objects—objects of a more material interest—kept in view and intended to be first carried out within the range of our ability. For instance, the completion of our canal system and the improvement of communication between the existing Provinces, the development of our trade and commerce, the settlement of the waste lands of the country which we now possess. Now the main question on this case is a question of policy. Before proceeding to this, I would remark that there is something very significant in our political state. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down declared that it was for the interest of the British Empire that this railway should be built—that we should accomplish this work and develop our resources in order to consolidate British power on this continent. But do we find a single dollar, assistance in any shape whatever contributed or promised by the Empire? No, we do not even find that anything has been asked. In the case of the Intercolonial Railway we had the guarantee of the British Government. Now we are asked to extend that road across the continent to the shores of the Pacific, and in that way hold up British power in America. Was that the object which brought these Provinces together? If that were the case, then we have a right to expect assistance from the British Government in accomplishing this great work. But what do we really see going on? We are told that we shall have the protection of Great Britain in case of difficulty, and yet the troops are removed, and we have evidences before

us to which we cannot be blind, that we are left in this Confederation entirely to ourselves. Though still a colony, we are extending our territory westward to the Pacific and undertaking all the responsibilities of these great enterprises, children as we are, we assume the obligations of an independent nationality, without the security and countenance we should have from the Parent State. It is not for me to complain of this, but I point out the facts for your careful consideration. Colonies, it should be remembered, are but *attaches* to the empire, under the agis of the State from which they derive their existence. Can we reconcile the fact of undertaking such national responsibilities, with our existing political conditions. It is not of the nature of Colonies to be aggressive. It never has been so. This is the attribute of the nation; this I make no complaint of, but I note the fact, and as we say in law, may act of it. The policy of Confederation now being carried out as indicated by Imperial proceedings and our Colonial movements is that we are to become an independent nation. The speech of the Hon. Postmaster General was certainly as argumentative and masterly an exposition of the policy of the Government as could be expected from one of its members. It has been truly said by that hon. gentleman that no one has opposed the admission of British Columbia into the Union. All of us seem to come to one point, and that is, as to the propriety of the Union. I believe it is a necessity if we are to become a nationality that we should hold out the hand of friendship to the other Provinces. But because I feel this, it does not follow that I am to accept the Union on any terms. Here we are giving British Columbia a representation outside of the principle applied to the other sections of the Dominion. The advocates of this Union tell us that there are some 10,000 or 12,000 whites and 50,000 Indians, in the country; but reading Dr. Ruttray's work, the Indian population in 1867 is put down at 15,000. A considerable difference between the two estimates. In presenting this matter before us in the light of a treaty, the Government are placing us in a very unfortunate position. A country like this, enjoying responsible Government and representative institutions for many years—with a superior system of colleges and schools—with a territory and resources in a high condition of development—is placed in the situation of a minor Province in this question. It was due to us as the larger, older, and more experienced country that we should have had the matter first submitted to us. British Columbia has no responsible Gov-

Hon. Mr. Sanborn.

ernment—there is a Legislative Council, only a portion of which is elective. The Government is virtually a one man power—virtually a despotism. However, that Government arranges the terms of Union with the Dominion of Canada, and then the whole scheme is brought before us, and we are told that it is a treaty which we cannot alter or amend. Such a course is humiliating to the Dominion of Canada. But the people of British America do not appear to consider it as a treaty, so far as they are concerned, for certain persons have sent in a requisition, according to the return before us, for some alterations in the terms. Under these circumstances no person can believe that we should not alter or modify these terms, and present them in that form which we think is most just and reasonable. The government have taken a very large and unnecessary responsibility upon themselves, and have endeavoured to tie the hands of both branches of Parliament so that they cannot deal, as they should, with these terms. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said that the only stumbling block in his way was the Inter-oceanic Railway, and I cannot for the life of me, see that he succeeded in removing it, and I must still believe that it remains in the same place. He told us in most glowing terms what would be the consequences of building the railway, that we would find gold, coal, and other minerals; but he did not tell us how we are to get the hard cash to build the railway. Now the Northern Pacific Railway may be considered, in many respects, analogous to this railway. Now I have before me the report of the Chief Engineer, in 1867, and he estimates the cost of the road from Duluth to Seattle, the Pacific terminus, 1775 miles at \$140,377,500 in greenbacks. At that time there would be \$100,000,000 at least. In his next report, made in 1870, the Engineer says: "In my report of 1867, to which I have referred, was made, and an estimate of cost given of the entire road based upon a general knowledge of the country derived from the representations of those who had passed over it. There was, at that time, no data for an estimate of cost of any portion of it from actual survey. Since then the report of Gen. Spalding hereto appended, had been received of his surveys, with a view to an estimate of cost have been made. His estimate for this portion, 232 miles, is about \$15,000 per mile, more than the estimate for the same distance in my published report. If the difference between the actual and the estimated cost is as great relatively on the remaining portion of the road, the whole cost of the road will be

reduced to \$125,000,000, and I think will not much exceed that amount if built with care and judgment, and with means adequate to its construction in the most economical manner." That is about two thirds of the length of our road, adding one third, then, for our road, and taking ten per cent. premium in gold in 1869, we have the cost just \$150,000,000 according to the report of the Engineer of the Northern Pacific.

Now with respect to our ability to accomplish the work. This Northern Pacific was incorporated in 1864, and after having been for two years in the market we find the following statement made by the shareholders.

"The corporation organized under their charter in the summer of 1864, and being deeply impressed with the importance of the enterprise, immediately inaugurated measures to provide funds for the construction of their road. But notwithstanding the many favourable provisions in their charter, including a liberal land grant, it was found impracticable after the most diligent and persevering efforts to induce capitalists to embark in the enterprise."

The result was that the Company did not get parties to invest in the work—they found that the land grant was not sufficient. With respect to the terms now proposed, we find the Government promise to commence the work within two and complete it by ten years. The Government admit that they have made a mistake—that is perfectly clear. On no point, in my opinion, was the Postmaster General led into such deep water as on this. In the other House, we find the leader of the Government coming forward and proposing a resolution as to the mode in which the road is to be built. Now, if the terms of the original resolutions are perfectly clear, why try and explain them afterwards. The difficulty is that the resolution in question does not affect our obligation. The Government of their own volition pledge us to construct a railway within a certain term of years. Governor Musgrave lets us into the secret of the opinion, he and others in British Columbia entertain with respect to the arrangement. He says frankly that they asked really more than they had a right to expect. As my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) said the other day, I cannot see how they had "the cheek" to make such a demand upon us. However, we voluntarily pledge ourselves, through the Government, to build the railway. We do not say that we will try to get somebody to build it, but we pledge ourselves to construct it—we contract a solemn obligation. My hon. friend, the Postmaster General surely cannot believe that we are

not bound literally to this pledge. If he does, then he must consider us—I do not like to use the word—certainly wanting in common sense. If the Postmaster General gives a promissory note to any one, and it is negotiated and falls into the hands of a third party. When it falls due, he says, I did not promise to pay it absolutely in three months. But the law does not give any such interpretation as that to contracts. If the Government does not keep faith in matters of treaty, its name and honour must suffer in the estimation of the world. I do not believe that they will add to the reputation of this country by imitating a system which must of necessity stamp us with Punic perfidy, from the very fact that we cannot fulfil our obligation. The Postmaster General has referred to the progress, of the wealth and the great development of the resources of this country; but I have made a simple comparison between the debt of the United States and our own. The debt of the United States was, on the first of November, 1870, \$2,346,931,652, or \$60.50 per head. The revenue last year was \$393,000,000. The surplus was \$162,000,000. Now the debt of Canada is \$80,000,000, and if we add \$150,000,000 to the amount, we have a debt of \$230,000,000, equal to \$2,300,000,000 for the United States, which has only just emerged from a long and most expensive war. In old times—some twenty years ago—we were accustomed to be horrified at the expenditure of a few millions, whereas now we are prepared at once to contract obligations to the extent of hundreds of millions. If the Postmaster General was unfortunate in any part of his argument, it was when he came to refer to the history of railway enterprises in this country. He says that they have redounded to the benefit of Canada. I am quite prepared to admit that. I have great confidence in railways—they are eminently civilizers. We have not, however, expended \$100,000,000 on the construction of these works. Capital came in largely from abroad, and those who invested it have never received one dollar for the investment. When the Grand Trunk Railway was proposed, we loaned £3,000 a mile. We had preferential security on the stock—we were told that the road would pay large dividends, but that failed to turn out the case. Then from time to time we were called upon to prop up the undertaking and assist it, and we did so. We relieved our loan by allowing preferential securities to be placed before us. The result is, that we have a railway which is certainly useful to the country, but all the capital has been sunk, and the shareholders have received no benefit from it. We found some of them high in office—some of

Hon. Mr. Sanborn.

them still so—prominent in bringing forward the scheme, and putting a glowing prospectus before the English people. The people who built the road, who were persuaded into giving up their savings and capital, were ladies and others, who had been impoverished in consequence of the inability of the Company to pay a single dollar of profit. Does the Postmaster General desire to see the stock taken up in the same way, and the same results accrue from the proposed railroad. There is another feature of the proposition which does not present itself more favourably to my mind. We are told that the road is to be built by private Companies. I very much fear that instead of having it built within ten years, it will be advanced very slowly in order to suit the purposes of private speculators. We are told that if we make any change in this treaty we must send it back to British Columbia for ratification. I do not see that this would be unwise. If we find that this is a project that we should not entertain, that it is far too onerous for this country, then I maintain we should take the only course open to us, consistent with our duty to the country. We should not undertake, as honest men, what we cannot see we are prepared to accomplish. None of us would undertake to incur a debt or perform an obligation which we have no present means of accomplishing; and yet this is precisely what the Government are doing. If they trust to the future to develop our resources and enable us to perform our obligation, they are trifling with Providence and not acting according to the principles that should govern their action. British Columbia has a right to know what we can and ought to do—we should not hold out hopes to her people which we may not be able to realize. We are told that this work can be accomplished by means of private companies, but I cannot believe any such company will be obtained when it is known that this road is to cost what has been stated. If the company can be found to take stock in this road, we may be sure it will not be long before it will come to us and tell the Government that they must build it themselves. The Postmaster General was unfortunate in his remarks respecting public opinion on this question. I did not read all the newspapers, but I have seen a good many since the subject came up, and notice that very grave doubts are not only expressed in the *Globe*, but in one of the organs of the Government, the *Toronto Telegraph*, that we have made such a financial arrangement. The local newspapers throughout the country pretty generally admit that the scheme is unjust to the Dominion. Another point which I must refer to is the

purchase of the lands. Whilst the Government undertake to incur so enormous an expenditure in connection with the railway, they agree to pay \$100,000 yearly in consideration of the lands advanced for the construction of that work. How the Government could ever have entertained a proposition of that character, I cannot understand. If British Columbia has any interest in having this road built, and uniting with Canada, surely she ought to be willing to give up so much of her territory as will be necessary for the purpose of securing communication between them and us. The more I consider the financial features of the scheme, as respects the railway, the more I see their unfairness, and am convinced of my duty to oppose them. When we ask for delay, we are told that if we do not act promptly, we may lose the colony. British Columbia is connected with the same great country to which we belong. If the United States should lay their hands upon it or make any bargain with any body living in the colony to annex it, the act on the part of any one in the colony would be treason, and as respects the United States a cause of war with England. All that we need to do is to show our willingness to receive British Columbia, and endeavour to meet her wishes conscientiously and honestly, but within the measure of our ability. Although I have great hopes of the future of this country, and believe that its progress must be promoted by the acquisition of the North West and the development of its resources—although I have every desire to see the colony of British Columbia united to the Confederation, yet I cannot give my assent to propositions which would pledge this country to undertake what it cannot possibly perform, and under these circumstances I must sustain the amendment (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—The policy of admitting British Columbia into the Union is acknowledged by every gentleman who has addressed this House since the debate on the resolutions commenced to-day. Not only is the advisability of this policy admitted by the country at large, but the very Act of Parliament under which we sit here contemplates the extension of the limits of the Confederation to the shores of the Pacific. Inasmuch as that policy is admitted, there is no necessity for making any elaborate argument in its favor, what we have to consider is whether it is timely and wise to acquiesce in the terms on which it is proposed to acquire British Columbia. With respect to the time, I think it has been always acknowledged throughout the country that the sooner all the provinces on this continent are united under one Government, the better for the

interests of the whole. Therefore, I think it is unnecessary to say anything as to the timeliness of entering into this arrangement, and I may proceed to discuss the terms. But before doing that I may say a few words with respect to the form in which this question is set before us. It has been commonly described as a treaty—a term rather too important, perhaps, but, nevertheless, I use it for the sake of convenience, since it has been accepted in this debate as a proper mode of expression. We must therefore accept or reject it as a whole—we cannot amend it. So it is with reference to every agreement entered into between peoples or individuals. If the agents of two individuals agree upon an arrangement reserving for the principals to affirm or reject, the effect of altering it is to throw it back and leave matters just where they were before. That would be the effect of our amending this agreement with British Columbia. If we altered it in the slightest degree, that is doing what British Columbia never agreed to. Should we offer other terms, it would be necessary that British Columbia should have an opportunity of saying whether she would assent to them or not. It is better as it is—that this more important body, which has to control Dominion affairs, and arrange the taxation of the whole Confederation, should have the last word in this matter and say whether we should close the bargain or not. The terms have been arranged under three heads—the political, financial, and railway. Now, with respect to the financial features of the scheme, every one must admit that it is absolutely necessary that British Columbia should have the ability to support her local government, and of meeting her local requirements. Now looking into the terms they seem to me fair and reasonable. The Dominion agrees to pay an annual subsidy of \$35,000, as in the case of the other Provinces; also, 80 cents per head, equivalent to \$48,000. These sums amount to only \$83,000, which is evidently altogether inadequate to meet the local wants of the colony. Therefore it was found necessary to supplement that amount by \$100,000—no very extravagant sum certainly. If instead of \$35,000, it had been shown that \$135,000 was required by British Columbia, in order to maintain her provincial services, and make such local improvements as she would require, this country could not have objected to give it, and that too without receiving any equivalent in the shape of land. Instead of that, however, the Government of the Dominion has stipulated that a strip of land, 40 miles wide, should be given along the route of the proposed railway in British Colum-

bia. If the information we have respecting the country is at all correct, that land must become very valuable in the course of time, and I think the country has every reason to be satisfied with this part of the arrangement. With respect to the constitutional or political terms—the representation in the House of Commons and Senate has been particularly referred to. It is quite true that it is not arranged quite in accordance with the terms of the British North America Act, but it must be remembered that those terms have been departed from in the case of other Provinces which have been added to the Dominion, and the Parliament has assented to the policy. The question is, whether would it be just to the Provinces in question, considering their isolated position and sparsely settled condition, to apply to them a principle which, carried out strictly, would probably leave them without any representation worth mentioning. Sound as the principle of representation may be, in the case of countries well settled, we must take territorial area and the circumstances of a colony into the account at times. It is certainly desirable that when we acquire any very great territory we should have in Parliament a certain number of gentlemen in both Houses to inform us with respect to the resources, condition and requirements of the country. The provisions respecting the railway have then been referred to as very objectionable, but it has been very justly remarked by the Postmaster General that whilst this arrangement was before the House for several months, there was scarcely an adverse opinion expressed in the press against it. The acquisition of British Columbia in fact, is merely carrying out a policy which led to the annexation of Manitoba and the North West Territory. Now, hon. gentlemen will acknowledge that there will be no advantage in acquiring these territories unless there are communications opened up to enable immigrants to come in and fill up the waste lands and make them profitable. Two years ago when the subject of communication with the North West Territory was before the House, I had an opportunity of urging the necessity and propriety of opening up communications from the head of Lake Superior to Fort Garry through British Territory. We then had Mr. Dawson's Report before us which stated that for a moderate expenditure a very tolerable route could be opened up which would enable immigrants to be transferred from the head of the Lake for a very small sum. In point of economy it is the true policy to open up this communication in some way from the head of Lake Superior. I think every effort should be made to give us a secure and

economical route for immigrants into the heart of the North West country. As respects the railway also, our policy should be as economical as practicable. I said at the time in question that the way to build up our country was to improve our communications and preserve friendly relations with the United States. Now a great deal has been said about the injudiciousness of building a railway through a comparatively *terra incognita*. I quite agree with gentlemen on this point, but I must again refer to what I said two years ago—that our policy should be to build a railway Westward from Pembina to Fort Garry, and thence westward to the Rocky Mountains, and thoroughly to explore the country eastward from Fort Garry to the settled portions of Ontario. What does this resolution say?

“11, The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of a Railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected, East of the Rocky Mountains, towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and further, to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of Union.”

If the railways of the United States are built up to the boundaries of the North West Territories, as they will be very soon, why not avail ourselves of the facilities they will afford us and thereby save large expenditures for the present. Beginning our railway then, westward of the frontier, we can work our way easily and economically; we can carry materials and supplies without difficulty; and furthermore we will at once open up a country most suitable for emigrants. I do not believe any other course than this can be easily adopted under existing circumstances. I do not yield to any honorable gentleman in the desire to see an Inter-oceanic Railway through British territory, but we should advance prudently, using the American lines to our North Western frontier, build our railway westwards through our prairie lands, which are so attractive to settlers, and carefully explore the country between Fort Garry and Lake Nipissing before undertaking to build a railway through it. I am not going to say anything with respect to the probable cost of a railway. There are no data which will enable any one in this House to make any positive assertions on the subject. We know that a great deal of the country through which it will run is prairie, and the expenses of construction there will not be very great. We also know from the experience of our neigh-

Hon. Mr. McPherson.

bours, that railway companies have found prairie land a very profitable source of revenue. Companies that were considered ruined at one time have eventually made fortunes out of such property. I can imagine a railway which, built with the aid of land grants and a small money subsidy, will combine with the American system and connect us in that way with the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Such a scheme would not involve us in any ruinous expenditures, but, connected with a comprehensive system of immigration, would have much effect upon the development of our resources. I am not afraid of those enormous burthens of which some hon. gentlemen have spoken being undertaken. I believe there is sufficient good judgment in the Parliament and Government to prevent any such ruinous results. It must be remembered too, that gentlemen from British Columbia will have places in Parliament, and will have an equal interest with ourselves in promoting the prosperity of the Dominion and preventing any unnecessary burthens being imposed on the country at large. It is absurd to say that the Exchequer of the Dominion is to be burthened with an expenditure of \$100,000,000—no one can seriously believe that there is any such design in contemplation. Would any government be insane enough to propose such a thing? Would the country sanction the policy? Or, in the next place, consider the utter impossibility of borrowing such a sum of money. It is not Parliamentary to suggest that gentlemen do not mean what they say, but certainly I do not understand how the hon. gentleman near me can think for a moment that the resources of the country will be burthened with \$100,000,000 to expend in this or any other enterprise. Whilst I could imagine a railway built without any serious burthen to the finances of the Dominion, at the same time I feel we have a very strong claim on the British Government for assistance to this project. I cannot doubt that that claim will be admitted in some way sooner or later. Of course many things may combine to delay the accomplishment of the project. A war in Europe would unquestionably prevent us getting money to build it—two or three bad harvests in our own country would have the same effect; but we hope that such calamities will not occur. If it is possible to build this road in the way proposed, the progress that this country will make during the next twenty years will be greater than we can now imagine, and enable us to meet any liabilities we may incur in connection with an undertaking which will be one of the chief causes of the increased prosperity of the Dominion. If gentlemen would only

consider the progress of this country since the construction of railways they would look with more confidence into the future. Reference has been made to the Grand Trunk Railway, in the course of the debate, for the purpose of awaking fears in the minds of some gentlemen with respect to the proposed road. It ought by this time to be admitted that the Grand Trunk Railway has contributed more than anything else to the progress of this country. If the rates of traffic which prevailed when the Company was first established had continued for three or four years after the G. T. R. was completed, the results would have been very different from what they were. The profits would then have fully come up to the promises held out in the prospectus. I would also say that I do not know of any country that has had its railways constructed so economically for herself as Canada. The expenditure upon railways in the Province of Canada—now Ontario and Quebec—was, as nearly as possible, \$125,000,000 of which the Province only contributed some \$20,000,000. Almost every other country situated as Canada is, that had to obtain money from abroad to build railways, had to guarantee a return of 5 per cent. I hope that this house will do as elsewhere and adopt these resolutions. My hon. friend spoke of dictation on the part of the other party to the agreement, namely British Columbia. I repeat that I cannot see any force in that objection. I think that whilst it is quite possible that the clause on the subject of the railway might be more clearly drawn up, it appears to be fully supplemented by the resolution that has been introduced elsewhere. I think that we may safely calculate on the progress that the Dominion has made and is making. Hon. gentlemen must admit that an unprecedented prosperity prevails throughout the country. Now it is obvious that had Confederation been the unwise measure that some gentlemen predicted, this prosperity would hardly now exist. The bounteous harvests, have, of course, much to do with the prevalent prosperity—much is due to the energy and industry of the people; but still Confederation, which has made us one people, and gives every section an interest in the prosperity of the whole, has tended to stimulate activity and develop our resources. All that we are now asked to do is to strengthen the Confederation by adding another Province, and developing resources which it must be hoped will enhance the prosperity and wealth of the Dominion, (applause.)

Hon. Mr. DEVER said he did not think it was necessary for him to say much on this subject, seeing it was so ably debated

by both sides of the House already. The principle of Union, until all British America was united, was admitted by every speaker on either side of the House. All then that remained to be done was to settle on the details of this contract, and as he had no reason to change his opinion and refuse to entertain that confidence he had steadily held in the honesty, wisdom, and legislative ability of the statesmen who projected Union, and had carried it on so far triumphantly, he saw no reason now to place his confidence in an Opposition, some of whom he knew to be actuated by no higher motives than infuriated disappointment. In answer to the remarks of some of the Opposition as to the value of the possessions in question no better answer could be given than the following statement taken from the *New York Tribune* of a late date. Speaking of the resources of British America the *New York Tribune* said: "The Red River and Saskatchewan territories embrace an area large enough for four or five large States of superior prairie and upland soil, with a good supply of coal and gold, and equal for agricultural purposes to Northern Michigan, Milwaukee, and Minnesota. Beyond the Rocky Mountains is British Columbia, abounding with gold, and containing the best and most abundant coal mines yet found on the Pacific Slope. It has a superior soil, a magnificent climate, and an abundance of fish. That colony is in every respect in 'natural superiority,' fully on a par with California and Oregon, and the Territory of Washington."

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 3rd, 1871.

After routine,

PRINTING.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD complained of delay in printing Bills. He feared that the delay was caused by inadequacy of prices charged and paid. The efficiency and promptitude of the old arrangement were wanting.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON corroborated this statement, and pointed out that the public lost, instead of gaining, by the present system despite the nominal saving in cost.

Mr. YOUNG said the present cheap system had proved to be inefficient, just as he had predicted it would, when this matter was before the House about two years ago. As much (if not more) was paid for printing as under the old system. He thought the chairman of the Printing Com-

mittee, who was present, ought to call the Committee together at as early a day as possible, and bring this question before them, so that some means might be taken to have the printing done more rapidly. He believed that the prices paid, taking all the different sections of the contract, were more than under the old contract, and at the same time, the work was not done in the same way as by the old contractors. The House must have learned from experience that it would have been much better to have taken the experience of practical men, and to have given fair prices for good work (hear, hear).

Mr. STEPHENSON said the work was done as promptly now as ever it had been done. He thought it was unfair and unjust so far as the contractor was concerned to bring up these complaints here.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said he merely spoke from his own experience, and he had found very great delay in furnishing work.

Mr. SIMARD confirmed the statements of the hon. member for Glengary (Mr. D. A. Macdonald) respecting delays in printing Bills. Especially with respect to French documents, he was compelled to say that justice had not been done the House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Lunenburg) said the Printer in this case had given reasons for delay which were not satisfactory. He stated two of his machines had given way. Now, such excuses should not suffice. The Printer ought to have sufficient presses to take the place of those which might break. He ought also to have an adequate staff of printers. While these were reasons for dilatoriness in supplying the printing, they were not proper excuses. Hunter and Rose having had to throw up their contract, there was no establishment in the city where any printing could be done but that of Mr. Taylor. The Printing Committee therefore, were without the means of supplying the present deficiency. It was unfortunate there should be delay, but they could not help it, as the present low price had driven away competition. It was for the House to say whether the present contract should be continued till the end of the contract period of five years, or adopt a new system.

Mr. STEPHENSON said the printing was as well done now as formerly, quite as promptly, while more cheaply. The Printers were not to blame, the fault of delay not lying with them.

Mr. SIMARD had gone to the translator's office to learn the cause of delay, and had learned the Printers had more work in their hands than they could perform.

Hon. Mr. Dever.

The last speaker could not as a practical man say he would undertake composition at twenty-five cents a thousand ems. The translators at any rate were not responsible for the delay.

Mr. BROUSSEAU stated that the Printer had excused himself by stating he had too much work to do, and that Government sometimes insisted on their measures taking precedence. The Printing Committee should consider as to the best means of expediting the work.

The subject was dropped.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Bills were read a second and third time and passed :

A Bill to incorporate the District of Bedford Bank.

A Bill to incorporate the Bank of Liverpool.

An Act to amend the charter of the Sun Insurance Company.

THE PROROGATION.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER in reply to Mr. Masson, of Soulanges, said that the intention of the Government was that, this House should sit every day this week, excepting on Good Friday. If the House would support the Government in despatching the public business as speedily as possible, there was an expectation that His Excellency could prorogue the House on Saturday next, but that it depended on the progress made with the business of both Houses.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he hardly needed to say that if the Government and their friends would show a less factious spirit than they had done, the business would be greatly facilitated, (laughter.) But the Government must tell the House what measures they intended to push on to completion. It was well known that there were some measures, one large one in particular, which the House had not yet had time to read, which would require long discussion in Committee as well as in this House. Then there was the Election Bill which had been postponed indefinitely without any reason that he could see. If the Government would deal with that Bill in the way he would like, perhaps it would not occupy much time, but if they did not deal with it in that spirit, it would take a great deal of time. It was of the last importance that the business should be done well, no matter what time it should take. The country did not expect them to push business through in an immature state.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that

Government intended to proceed with all the Bills on the orders of the day. Tomorrow or Wednesday the Minister of Finance would be in a position to lay the supplementary estimates before the House and then there was a measure which was not yet before the House, to extend to Manitoba and British Columbia when it should come into the Union the general clause of the Act relating to the Public Departments just for a short time. Then, with regard to the election law, Government intended to proceed with it. The reason why they did not press it earlier, was on account of the absence of the honourable member for Lambton, the hon. member for West Durham and other important members on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE—My excuse is that I was away on election business (a laugh).

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was idle, from what had just been said to expect that the House should be prorogued on Saturday. Friday would be a holiday. What reason was there to suppose, then, that the supplementary estimates, which would be of unusual magnitude, coming down on Wednesday, too, could be disposed of in time to prorogue the House on Saturday. Why could not the Government say to their followers that it would be impossible to prorogue the House this week, instead of endeavoring to throw the blame of delay on those who were willing to remain any length of time, in order to discharge their duty faithfully to the country.

The subject was dropped.

REVENUE COLLECTION, MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY, in reply to Mr. Oliver, said that no returns of revenues collected in Manitoba had yet been received by the Government. In reply to another question as to whether the Hudson's Bay Company had paid any duties on goods imported into the North West Territory in 1870 and if so, how much, the Minister of Customs said it was difficult to get accurate returns, but he believed about \$10,500 had been received in duties from the Hudson's Bay Company. These were paid for goods consumed in territory which was supposed to belong to Ontario before the acquisition of the North West by the Dominion. The amount paid to the 30th June last was \$10,422.

Mr. MILLS asked if Government intended to appoint a Collector of Customs at York Factory.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY replied that the matter was under the consideration of the Government. He had a communication

from the Collector of Customs at Sault Ste Marie to the effect that collections could be made through him. During the past year \$5,522 had been collected at Sault Ste Marie on goods imported via York Factory into the Dominion.

THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE TROOPS.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT moved for an Address to Her Majesty setting forth: That this House fully recognizes the duty of the Dominion to maintain order throughout the vast Territory now entrusted to its care, and also its obligation to contribute to the utmost of its power towards its own defence against foreign invasion from whatever quarter. That this House does not desire to express any opinion upon the system of concentration which they learn has now become the settled policy of Her Majesty's Government, but that nevertheless in view of the peculiar and anomalous position of Canada, lying as it does, conterminous for several thousand miles with a very powerful State, many of whose inhabitants are notoriously actuated by sentiments of bitter hostility to the British Empire—this House cannot but feel that the above policy, however just and expedient it may be as a whole, has been pushed to an extreme limit in the case of this Dominion, and that the total and precipitate withdrawal of all garrisons and munitions of war from every portion of British North America, (prior to the perfect consolidation of these extensive Provinces under one Government) is calculated to excite much uneasiness in the minds of many of Her Majesty's most faithful subjects on this Continent. He said he was aware that there were people both in the House and outside of it, who deemed it unwise to deal with a subject of this kind. He thought differently however, for if this was not a subject with which this Parliament should deal, it was idle for them to sit here. In view of the discussions in the British Parliament and the assurances of the British Government to the Canadian Government, it would be unwise for this House to shut their eyes to any part of the Imperial policy affecting this Dominion. He did not intend in the slightest degree to censure the colonial policy of great Britain. He merely wished to speak of it as affecting this Colony which was admitted to occupy a different position from that of any other Colony of the Empire. There was no doubt that the Government of Great Britain had shown a want of vigor and zeal in protecting the honour of Canada. He contrasted the manner in which the British Government had acted when a Canadian subject had been murdered by rebels in the North

West while under British authority, with the course which the Imperial Government pursued towards Abyssinia in the recent expedition to that country. The contrast between the policy of Great Britain to her subjects in the East and her subjects in the West was a little too marked. Then again, with regard to the Fenian invasion, the mother country had not taken up our cause as she should have done. He contrasted the manner in which the Fenian leaders had been treated by the American Government, with the treatment which the St. Albans' raiders had received at our hands. Did any one suppose that if the Ku Klux organization established headquarters in Canada, and made occasional raids into the United States (and he considered that the Ku Klux were very similar in character to the Fenians) did any one suppose that the United States Government would not have demanded reparation for the outrages without delay. The Fenian raids were the result of hostility to Great Britain and this Dominion was subjected to outrages from the Fenian organization through our position as a British Colony. He believed, therefore, that Great Britain should have taken up our cause with greater energy and promptitude than she had done, and demanded indemnification for these raids. It was hardly fair or generous for Great Britain to withdraw her troops at the time they were taken from the country. The request of this Government that a small body of troops should be left with us to serve as a rallying point in case of emergency, should not have been denied us. He had not the slightest doubt that the people of this country were competent to repel raiders on this country, but still, the Imperial Government should have left some small assistance in case of sudden attack. The fortifying of Halifax was practically useless, for the only enemy we had to fear would not take the trouble to attack us through a sea-port while much more convenient localities could be found on our frontier. He concluded by sharply criticising the policy of Mr. Gladstone's Government.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he desired to call the attention of the hon. mover of the resolution to the circumstance that his motion did not recite the real state of the facts. Though unfortunately the greater number of Her Majesty's troops had been withdrawn from the Dominion, they had not been withdrawn entirely, there being still the garrisons at Halifax and Quebec. As to the merits of the motion he might say that, generally, it embodied the views of the Government. The Government had availed itself of every opportunity to remonstrate against the

Hon. Mr. Tilley.

entire withdrawal of Her Majesty's troops, and one of the express objects for which he and the member for North Lanark had visited England was for that purpose. Subsequently the Postmaster General was deputed to press on the Imperial Government the necessity for not withdrawing the whole of the troops, and especially of continuing Quebec as a permanent garrison on the same footing as Halifax. He had been instructed to urge that Quebec was, as it were, the Gibraltar of the Continent, and that it was most important that a certain number of British troops should be stationed there. The Government would not offer any opposition to the passage of the resolution, but when the House should be in Committee on it, he hoped the mover would alter it so as to correctly state the facts of the case, and he would suggest also that there should be added a clause to the effect that the House expected that Quebec would be continued permanently to be occupied by British troops. He could not, however, agree with the desponding view which the member for Lennox had taken of the question, with regard to the determination of England to maintain, with all her might, the British Flag on the Continent. Though the Government regretted the sudden withdrawal of the troops, they had, at the same time, been repeatedly assured that that withdrawal was not with a view to impress the people of Canada with the feeling that in case of need, the power of England would not be applied to the defence of their country, on the contrary, they had been informed in several despatches that the arrangement was merely for times of peace, and the Imperial Government had given repeated assurances that in case of need the power and might of England would always be ready to defend Canada. He made these remarks in order to remove any doubts on the subject that might be created in the minds of the people by the expressions of the member for Lennox. He himself, and the Government also, was quite sure that England was determined to continue the British connection, and that nothing would ever be done on the part of England which would be conducive to break up the happy tie now uniting the different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he should have no objection to make the alterations suggested.

The House then went into Committee to consider the resolution, Hon. Mr. BLANCHET in the chair, and rising, reported progress, and asked leave to sit to-morrow.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) moved an

Address for a statement of monies expended on the Beauharnois Canal. He regretted that the Canal Commission had not given this Canal the attention it ought to have received. He had replied to a series of questions put to him on the subject by the Commissioners, but found on his arrival at Ottawa that his letter had not been considered. The canal had, undoubtedly, been constructed on the wrong side of the river, and he trusted the Government would ask an appropriation of money to remedy the evil.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Government had no objection to agree to the address, as the mover said that the canal had been built on the wrong side of the river, and that the amount required for its enlargement would exceed that necessary to construct a canal on the other side. The letter written by the hon. member had been lost sight of, but the Government would take his views into consideration.

Motion carried.

CONDUCT OF SOLDIERS IN THE N. W.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) moved an address for copies of correspondence respecting the conduct of soldiers forming part of the Military Expedition.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was no correspondence on the subject that could be brought before the House.

Motion allowed to stand.

Orders in Council, Departmental Regulations, &c.

Mr. MILLS renewed his motion for the consideration of a resolution declaring it expedient that Orders in Council, Departmental Regulations and Proclamations of a permanent character, having the force of law, be printed each year, in the same manner as the statutes of Canada. He hoped no objection would be made to the motion, as he was satisfied the publication of the documents would prove a great convenience.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the question was one of money, rather than anything else, and the Government would give their attention to the matter, and would show their decision when the supplementary estimates were brought down.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said when the motion was first made, he had doubted the expediency of the proposal, but from circumstances that had recently come to his knowledge, he was persuaded of the necessity of publishing all such documents. He was often surprised, however, to see how ready the House was to hand over the legislative power to the Government.

Motion allowed to stand.

PUBLICATION OF DEBATES.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET moved an instruction to the Hon. the Speaker with other Commissioners on Internal Economy of the House to secure Stenographers for the publication of debates. He said he had no fault to find with the way in which the debates were at present published in the newspapers, but he thought it was very necessary that a full official report should be published in both languages. He spoke of the anxiety of persons to become members of the House, not only on account of being able to represent the interests of their constituents, but on account of the vast amount of information to be obtained while sitting in the House. Some very important debates had taken place since Confederation, and yet it would be a matter of the greatest difficulty to ascertain the views expressed by the leading minds of the country in those debates. He hoped the motion would be adopted so that a proper account of the debates might be obtained and published in both languages.

Mr. YOUNG said there was only one way in which such an account could be economically obtained, and that was as proposed by the Printing Committee in 1868. It was most necessary that such a report should be had, and it was done in almost every other country. The reputation of every member of the House rested very largely in the hands of the reporters, and it was only fair there should be an official reliable report that could not be questioned. Nothing was said in the motion as to the printing of the debates, whereas the scheme of 1868 had included the reporting and publication of the debates at an estimated cost of \$12,000, and he did not think that amount too much.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the question was one of great difficulty, inasmuch as at present no newspaper could undertake to print everything that was said. There was also the difficulty of the two languages; and if he thought that the debates could be published in both languages for \$12,000 he should consider it money well spent. The debates of the Senate would have to be included and he hardly thought that \$12,000 would provide any large number of copies.

Mr. DUFRESNE opposed the proposition on the ground of its cost.

Hon. Col. GREY said there was no question of the advantage to be derived from the carrying out of the proposition, as although the present reports were very fair, they could not be so full as desirable. In the Lower Provinces, reporters had been advertised for and engaged, and so the labour was properly divided, and the re-

port obtained could not be otherwise than reliable, it being open to correction. The expense had amounted to \$1,600 a session.

Mr. MILLS said he understood from the reporters and he had no doubt that \$4000 would cover the entire cost of reporting for the Session, and he supposed the printing could be down like any other official printing at the usual contract rates. He thought the speeches should be reported in the language in which they were uttered.

Mr. CURRIER trusted the motion would not carry as he was convinced the cost would be very great.

Mr. MACKENZIE referred to a report of the Printing Committee, recommending the reports to be taken verbatim, but extended at not quite so great length. It was estimated that this would take about 14 columns of newspaper printing daily and would cost, the speeches being printed in the language they were uttered, about \$12,000, translation costing \$4,000 more. This would be much less if the printing was done at the present contract rates. He was entirely agreed as to the necessity of an official report, and thought it would tend to lessen rather than increase the length of the debates.

Mr. POPE thought the publication of the debates in the way proposed would very much lengthen the debates, and he was of opinion that nothing should be done in the matter. The money would be squandered away for nothing.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry), thought that if the motion were carried out the debates would be endless, and that the country already received a quite sufficiently full report, and he hoped the matter would be voted down.

Mr. GIBBS had always opposed the matter on the grounds that it would cost more than it was worth, but he thought the matter should be given a trial, and he should therefore vote for it.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. BELLEROSE regretted that the motion of the member for Levis had been brought before the House, and would vote against it.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER agreed with the hon. member for Lambton that faithful reports of the debates in this House would tend to improve the tone of the speeches. Private enterprise has no doubt been successful in sending summaries of the debates throughout the country, but, still, that did not do away with the necessity

Hon. Mr. Blanchet.

of having authentic official reports made. Objection had been made to the ground taken by the hon. member for Lambton that verbatim reports were not necessary. No unfairness need be shown to anyone. In Nova Scotia, where official reports had been made, the system had proved very successful.

A Committee formed of members from both sides of the House, at once checked anything like unfairness. He was opposed to the idea that the speeches should be printed only in the language in which they were delivered. It would not cost a great deal to publish all of them in both languages. A tender had been received last year offering to publish very full reports in both languages for \$10,000. He considered that amount too small. It was too late to make any arrangements for the present session, but he hoped some plan would be adopted to take reliable reports next session. He was confident that if fairly tried for once, it would never be given up. [Hear, hear.]

MR. BLAKE could seldom agree with his honourable friend, but he coincided with him this time in the opinion that the debates should be published in both languages. He did not think the Confederation debates should be accepted as anything like a fair test of the system. It was understood at that time that a great deal of latitude should be allowed to speakers, and everyone was expected to make a speech. He was in favor of giving it a trial for one session at least. He knew it was a trial of strength between the speaking and the silent members, and as the latter were in the majority, they might vote down the motion.

Messrs. KIRKPATRICK and WEBB opposed the motion on the ground of economy.

MR. BARTHE supported the motion, and thanked the English speaking members for the liberal spirit they had shown towards the Quebec members. The French members had a special interest in having impartial reports taken, for, under private enterprise their speeches were seldom reported.

MR. ROSS (Victoria) said this was an age of progress, and the people should know from authentic sources what was going on in their legislative halls.

After some further discussion,

MR. CHEVAL moved that the motion be amended by adding the following words: "and the expenses thereof be paid out of the personal indemnity of the members" (cheers, and laughter).

The amendment was carried amid roars of laughter.

The motion as amended was then put and lost—Yeas 51, Nays 90.

YEAS.—Messrs. Baker, Barthe, Beatty, Bechard, Benoit, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bowell, Brown, Carmichael, Cheval, Chipman, Colby, Currier, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Ferguson, Fournier, Geofrion, Godin, Grey, Huntington, Jones, (Halifax), Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Killam, Langlois, Little, Macdonald (Middlesex), Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Renfrew), Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pinsonneault, Pozer, Renaud, Ross (Dundas), Ryan (Montreal West), Savary, Smith (Westmoreland), Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson, Ontario), Tupper, Whitehead, Willson, Wood, and Young.—51.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Bertrand, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier, (Sir George E.), Cayley, Cimon, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford (Brockville), Crawford (Leeds), Daoust, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grover, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holmes, Jackson, Joly, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Lawson, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacFarlane, Masson, (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McCallum, McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, McMonies, Merritt, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Pope, Pouliot, Ray, Redford, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Sriver, Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Snider, Sproat, Stephenson, Stirton, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tremblay, Wallace, Walsh, Webb, Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Workman, Wright (Ottawa County), and Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.)—90.

GEORGE STERLING'S CLAIM.

MR. CURRIER moved for a Select Committee to consider correspondence respecting the claim of George Sterling against the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said the motion could not be proceeded with without the Government's assent, and he thought the proceeding irregular.

MR. CURRIER explained the nature of the claim.

Hon. MR. MACDOUGALL objected to the mode of procedure proposed, as tending to decisions being come to by Committees on very cursory examinations, in favour of claims, which the Government might have the very best grounds to refuse. He had had the case under his con-

sideration when Minister of Public Works, and maintained Mr. Sterling had no claim against the Crown, and under no circumstances was it a proper case for the consideration of a Committee of the House, as the Government alone should be held responsible for a proper settlement.

Mr. CURRIER again spoke of the circumstances of the case, and repeated that it was only fair that the case should be considered by a Committee.

Mr. JOLY asked that his name might be struck out of the Committee, and thought the matter should be laid before the Board of official Arbitrators.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that when the matter first came before him he found that his predecessor had decided against the claim, but the claim being again urged on legal grounds, he referred the matter to the Minister of Justice who reported that there was no claim in law whatever.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected that the whole motion was out of order, as no Committee could be appointed to consider a claim against the Crown, except with the assent of the Government.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought that Parliament should be able to consider any grievance.

The SPEAKER ruled the motion out of order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the motion was not only out of order, but most undesirable.

Some further conversation took place on the point of order, but the Speaker confirmed his ruling, and the motion was withdrawn.

PRINTING.

Mr. BROUSSEAU moved the adoption of the 7th Report of the Joint Committee on Printing—Carried.

INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. MILLS said that some names of Townships on maps in the Indian Department had led him to suppose that the Government considered that all unsundered lands of the Indians were under the control of the Indian Department, whereas they were really under the control of the Local Government.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the matter could not be discussed without proper notice, and as the motion had not been on the notice paper, it must be postponed.

PATENT LAW.

Mr. OLIVER moved the second reading

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

of "An Act to amend the Patent Act of 1869." He said that he had postponed the consideration of this matter more than once, and he now thought he was entitled to an expression of opinion from the Government. His amendments applied to the 12 months residence in Canada required of every applicant for a Patent, and as to the extension of Patents.

Mr. BROWN thought the Bill should not be pressed. It was not in the interests of the people, and was certainly not desirable at the present time.

Mr. SCATCHERD also opposed the Bill. He thought it would open the way to the flooding of the country with American Patents, and thought there were quite enough Patents already.

Mr. CAMERON (Baron) said he hoped the measure would be pressed. The Government was committed to it, having undertaken to introduce a measure to remedy the evil themselves, and had promised that when Americans took off their discriminations against Canadian inventors, they would do the same with regard to American inventors. He believed the Bill to be in the interests of the country.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the Government at this moment, were not prepared to cede much to the Americans on any question, and could not assent to the Bill. The present law on the matter of residence had been tried two years, and there was no reason to change it. As to the matter of extension of time, it was not of very great importance, but there was certainly no advantage in the proposed change, as the majority of Patents were of no practical value, and it was, therefore, advisable to limit them to five years in the first instance, after which, if valuable, they could be extended, and if otherwise, they lapsed. Government was not prepared to legislate on the subject at present, and certainly not in the way proposed. He hoped the measure would not be pressed.

Mr. OLIVER had no desire to force the Bill on the House, but at the previous session, the Minister of Agriculture had promised to consider the Patent Law, and introduce some amendments. He thought it very desirable that Americans should be allowed to obtain Patents—but leaving that point, he thought it was very hard that a Patent should only be granted for five years, which interfered very much with the sale of Patent rights. He thought the Government should undertake to consider this section of the law.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said that there was now no hesitation as to the renewal of

Patents, which might be obtained at any time.

Mr. OLIVER withdrew his Bill.

STERLING'S CLAIM.

Sir. A. T. GALT said he desired to revert to the matter of Mr. Sterling's claim. The motion was only to refer certain papers to a Committee, and not a step towards any appropriation. He, therefore, submitted the question for the further consideration of the Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that the object of the motion, as stated by the mover, was for the payment of a claim.

The SPEAKER asked leave to withhold his ruling till to-morrow, and the motion was allowed to stand.

INSOLVENCY LAWS.

Mr. COLBY moved the second reading of an Act to repeal the Insolvency Laws now existing in this Dominion. He would very much like to let the matter stand, in order to facilitate the business of the House, but could not do so in view of the dissatisfaction that existed on the subject. The matter had been thoroughly discussed, and, no doubt, there were many arguments in favor of the law, but it was certainly not a beneficial law for Canada, however well it might have acted in other countries. The law had had a trial, and members would be able to say from their own experience what the tendency of the law had been. He believed the tendency had been highly immoral, as people were coming to believe that the discharge from an obligation was equivalent to the payment of that obligation, and the great facilities for passing through the Insolvency Court, were exceedingly injurious. As an exceptional case an Insolvency Law might be an advantage, but as a general principle it could not be justified. It did away with all stimulus to any one in embarrassed circumstances, and a man in that position instead of making every exertion to extricate himself found it much easier to take advantage of an Insolvency Act. The effect of the Act was to sap all commercial morality, and if not yet generally apparent throughout the country it would gradually become so, and the time had arrived when it might safely be abolished. He felt it his duty to press the Bill.

Mr. CURRIER thought some provision should be made for those who might now be preparing to take advantage of the Act.

Mr. COLBY did not anticipate the Bill

would become law this Session, and therefore, every one would have ample notice.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas), was in favour of the measure, as many commercial transactions were carried on under the most deceptive appearances, and the Act opened the way to numbers of swindlers. Every one who contracted a debt should pay it, and not have so many facilities for escaping payment.

Mr. OLIVER in seconding the motion for the second reading of the Bill, said that though there were, at the time of the passing of the Act, many reasons in its favour, he believed it now to be entirely unnecessary. Many dishonest speculators were now able to go into business, looking forward to a sure relief in the Insolvency Act, and in this way great harm was done to the honest trader. The only classes now benefited by the Act were lawyers and assignees, and there could be no doubt of its evil effects in commercial matters, and it was very necessary in the interest of the country that it should be repealed. Unless in exceptional cases in times of "commercial crisis," a creditor should not be forced to accept a part of the amount due him.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the measure was a large one, inasmuch as it was to do away with what was now the law of the land. He thought at this time of the session the Bill had better not be pressed, and would suggest the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. COLBY said that although he had no intention to have his measure made law this session, he would very much like an expression of opinion by the House if the Leader of the Government saw no special objection.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved in amendment to the second reading that the debate should be adjourned till next Thursday week.

A division was had on the amendment, and resulted as follows:—Yeas 60, nays 79.

YEAS.—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Beau-bien, Bellerose, Benoit, Blake, Bolton, Bowell, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carling, Carmichael, Cartier [Sir George E.], Chipman, Cimon, Costigan, Dobbie, Dunkin, Forbes, Gaudier, Gaudet, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Hincks [Sir Francis], Hurdon, Irvine, Jones [Hali-fax], Jones [Leeds and Grenville], Lacerte, Langevin, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald (Middle-sen) Masson [Terrebonne], McConkey, McMonies, Merritt, Metcalfe, Mills, Morris, Renaud, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Savary, Smith [West-

moreland], Snider, Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tupper, Walsh, Wells, Willson, Wood, Workman, and Young.—60.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Béchard, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Cameron [Huron], Caron, Cayley, Cheval, Colby, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Delorme [St. Hyacinthe], Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fournier, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Grover, Hagar, Holmes, Holton, Huntington, Jackson, Joly, Keeler, Killam, Kirkpatrick, Langlois, Lapum, MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, Masson [Soulanges], McCallum, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, Moffat, Morrison [Niagara], Munroe, Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pope, Pouliot, Pozer, Redford, Ross [Dundas], Ross [Prince-Edward], Ross [Wellington, C.R.], Ryan [Montreal West], Rymal, Scatcherd, Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Stirton, Sylvain, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tourangeau, Tremblay, Wallace, Webb, White [Halton], White [East Hastings], Whitehead, and Wright [Ottawa County].—79.

The motion for the second reading was carried.

Mr. COLBY moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill next Thursday week. He had no desire to press the House to a hasty decision on this important measure, but he would next session bring it up again, and he hoped the Act would be swept from our Statute books.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the honorable gentleman might have brought in the Bill for the purpose of trying the temper of the House, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) was not disposed to have any such step taken. He, therefore, moved in amendment that the Bill be referred to the Committee of the whole to-morrow.

Mr. WORKMAN hoped this law would not be annulled, for it had proved to be of great service to hundreds of unfortunate men and to their creditors. Honest men need have nothing to fear; it was only rogues against whom it was directed.

Mr. CURRIER moved in amendment, that the House go into Committee on the Bill forthwith.

Mr. SIMARD said the Bill was ruining the retail trade of the country. People who entered into business should be made to understand that they must conduct it legitimately.

After a long discussion the Bill was ruled out of order, the House having passed on another Bill on the same subject, affirming an opposite principle.

Mr. BOWELL'S Bill, to remove doubts

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

as to the legality of certain marriages therein mentioned, was, after some discussion, discharged.

The House adjourned at one o'clock.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 4th, 1871.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock, and the adjourned debate was resumed.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY.—It is impossible to approach the discussion of this question without being impressed with a deep sense of its magnitude. Last year whilst two of the foremost nations of Europe were engaged in a deadly struggle involving the lives of hundreds of thousands, for the possession of a mere strip of land on the left bank of the Rhine, this country was peacefully annexing a region nearly one half the size of Europe; and at this hour we are asked to consider the propriety of annexing a further piece of territory which will equal if it does not exceed the whole of France. Impressed with this view I desire to discuss the question with a deep sense of the responsibility which attaches to myself as well as to others who take part in it, and with a gravity and moderation adapted to the vital issues involved to us and to our children (hear hear). I shall refrain, on the one hand, from attempting to influence the House by any dazzling picture of the effects to be produced by this measure, on the other from pandering to prejudices by endeavouring to raise a bugbear of the results likely to accrue. It must be confessed that we have been rather unfortunate in our negotiations with respect to the acquisition of territory. We proposed what were undoubtedly too liberal terms to Prince Edward Island and to Newfoundland and because of this perhaps they have been rejected. In the case of Manitoba we have been compelled to give £300,000 sterling for almost nothing so far as the persons who received that money were concerned. It was not for sovereignty, for that came from the Queen—it was not for trading rights, for those were left intact—it was not for possessions, for we left the Hudson's Bay Company's possessions intact, and we confirmed the titles of thousands of people who had derived their titles from them, so that many persons think we have given up the finest part of the territory. Since then we have been knocking at the gate of the Pacific with a view of getting Vancouver Island and British Columbia into the Union. The House has

now before them the terms which were originally asked by British Columbia as conditions of coming into the Dominion, and those which have been agreed to by their Legislature and the Government of Canada. I am bound to say from an examination of the terms we are called upon to sanction that they are infinitely more onerous than those offered to us a year ago—it is probably the old story of the Sybilline leaves over again; and I for one regret that we should not have accepted them or some slight modification of them. Instead of committing ourselves to a policy of indefinite expenditure of money within a definite period of time, it would have been wise had we secured something like the terms on the question of the railway which were offered to us. Instead of being bound to commence this railway within two years, we were offered a limit of three years, and we were not required to construct this railway within a limited period.

At the outset of this discussion we are met by a constitutional objection which I cannot pass by since it comes from a gentleman whose opinions on constitutional and legal points are entitled to every respect. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Sanborn) has referred us to the 146th section of the Act of Union and doubted the constitutionality of our proceedings. Now there may be a great deal in the objection and if so it is only another proof among many of the incomplete manner in which the Union Act was framed, but if my hon. friend will permit me, I will refer to the section which he has quoted, which gives power on the address of the Houses of Parliament to admit Rupert's Land, and the North Western Territories, British Columbia, or either of them into the union "on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the address expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, *subject to the Provisions of this Act*, and the Provisions of any order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." I put to my friend whether these words—they may be obscure but not such as to prevent us understanding them—are not sufficiently strong as to the mode of procedure. The Queen's order in Council is to be followed up by a proclamation. British Columbia asks to be admitted and we agree to the request. The Queen is the fountain of honor and she consents by her proclamation that these Senators shall be appointed. In section 28 the number of Senators is limited to 78. But perhaps the question may be settled in the Act about being submitted to the Imperial Parliament. At all events, so far as I am concerned I feel that the Government are res-

ponsible for the constitutionality of the Act.

I am not surprised at the objections made to some of the terms of this arrangement, which few I think will deny are of a most exacting character [hear, hear]. I think it might have been the wiser course for the government, could they have secured such terms in the negotiations as would have simply pledged us to secure the construction of the railway from the Pacific to our lines upon such conditions as they could arrange with Companies thoroughly examining the route. I regret some such arrangement was not made, but now that these resolutions are here we must take them as they stand. I cannot agree with my hon. colleague from Nova Scotia [Mr. Miller] who put down the cost of the Central Pacific Railway at \$32,000,000 to the United States Government; for on reference to an authority on the subject I find that the American Government for that line of 1774 miles gave a large subsidizing equal to \$52,800,000 besides a guarantee for interest on an equal amount, and all this irrespective of the lands for alternate 20 miles sections. I am not willing to pledge this country to assume any such burthens, but I think when we come to consider the question, we will find that no such burthens are to be imposed upon us in the present instance. With the experience, however, of the United States before us, we have no reason to suppose that 2,500 miles of railway can be built for less than that amount of money. We have every reason to suppose that should the government undertake the construction of this work, we would be landed in an expenditure of at least \$150,000,000. The Companies in the United States had doubtless some additional capital of their own besides the government assistance which amounted to nearly \$60,000 a mile. We are now asked under these resolutions to construct the work in ten years and I do not hesitate to say that so far as I am able to judge that is perfectly impracticable, and delusive. Suppose a war was to break out in Europe or on this continent, all these plans would be disarranged, or take the case of the Intercolonial Railway which is being built in a time of peace. A few days ago the Postmaster General said, in answer to an enquiry, that we are not likely to have the Intercolonial Railway finished in very much less than three years from this time, or seven years from the period of Union, and if seven years have been found necessary to survey and construct 500 miles near a continuous highway and stopped at half a dozen points by water communication, how long will it take, and how much will it cost to construct 2,500 miles at such a vast distance from the

base of operations? In connection with this the House will see that one of the greatest difficulties we would have to encounter would be the cost of getting up supplies and materials along the route—the iron, say 100 tons per mile, and other plant, material, and supplies. All this shows that we should not delude ourselves with the idea that this is a work which is going to be surveyed immediately and constructed in the course of a few years. The smallest subsidy of \$32,000 per mile before mentioned was over a prairie country; for on one-third of the Pacific Railway, the railway followed the spade and the plough, and a mile was often laid in a day—the greatest difficulty was the moving of supplies. Were we to consider these resolutions alone I could not consistently give them my support, but we have had the matter put before us in a very different light. The Government, for some reason of their own, have been impressed with the idea that it was not desirable for them to undertake such a herculean task, and it is due to the Postmaster-General to say that in his able and persuasive speech he indignantly repudiated the idea that the Government intended to take such a burthen upon their shoulders. In addition to that we have the fact that the leader of the Government elsewhere has, in his place, brought down a resolution by which he asks Parliament to resolve that the Government shall not construct the work but that it shall be built by a company by means of a liberal grant of land and by a subsidy commensurate with the finances of the country, and that these amounts are to be hereafter determined by Parliament. Under these circumstances the matter is presented to my mind in a very different light. I have not only confidence in the resolutions as a record of Parliament, but I have confidence that the Government will not withdraw from the solemn pledge they have made in both Houses—that it is not the intention of the government to construct the work as a government work; and I say this the more emphatically because it would be contrary to all my principles in public life were I to consent that this work should be constructed in that way. For many years in Nova Scotia I was brought into conflict with persons who were advocating these government railways and the best proof that I was correct is afforded by the fact that at this very day, after the works have been assumed by the Dominion, we find the representatives of the people urging that these roads should be handed over to private companies. The government however repudiated the idea of undertaking the construction of this great work. My hon. friend from Wellington Division says that this does

not appear in the resolutions; but he should remember that we are not dealing with foreigners but with persons who are to be a portion of our population and to take a share in the legislation of the Dominion, and they are not likely to agree to impose heavy burthens upon the whole country of which they are to form a part, and with whose prosperity they will be for all time identified. The hon. member should also remember that the question of the railway is not simply a British Columbia question. So far as we are concerned it is of Canadian importance for more than two-thirds the distance. We have the whole of the North West to open up, and that can never be achieved except by communications which will bring immigrants into the country. If my hon. friend had a dozen capitalists consulting with him as to a railway across the North West Territory, would he not have a better chance of getting good terms from them when he could give them a superior terminus on the Pacific shore, than by stopping at the foot of the Rocky Mountains?

My hon. friend from Toronto strongly urged the propriety of commencing the construction of the railway at Pembina, and taking it to Fort Garry and thence westward. This view is a rational one, and commends itself to us in many ways. If we have a line to Pembina connecting with the American system of railways we have the means of moving our materials and supplies with facility and comparative cheapness. More than that, you will have a tide of emigration following the road—the laborers, on the completion of the line will naturally settle alongside of it. Most of the land in the North West, so far as we know, is superior to that through which the American railways pass. The sandy desert which the American line crosses extends all the way up with an average breadth of some 500 miles to the North, and comes into the North West Territory, which now belongs to the Dominion, its apex resting upon the head waters of the Assiniboine. But the portion of it in British Territory is very small—it is the only part of the great valley which is unproductive—all the rest of it has a soil infinitely superior to anything to the southward. You have there at once an inducement for immigrants to settle because you have the best land unencumbered by the forest which is often a terror to persons unaccustomed to that sort of life, and you offer homes to millions from other lands. My hon. friend from Nova Scotia said we had the best line on the continent; I am quite aware that we have the best pass through the Rocky Mountains. What the country may be over the steppes of British Columbia I cannot say, nor can he. Neither can

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

we say what the features of the country from Rainy Lake to Lake Nipissing may be. These are some of the difficulties which beset me at the outset when I come to consider the propriety of building this railway within a definite time at an indefinite cost. But we are told we should pause before incurring any additional liabilities which we may find it difficult to meet. Have my hon. friends considered the steady progress of the population and resources of this country? Look at the opening up of the great North Western country—it must necessarily lead to great immigration not only of the young men of Canada, but from Europe who will become consumers and tax payers. Then we must take into account the effect of this enormous expenditure within our borders upon the increasing resources of this country (hear, hear). The Government propose to aid this work by a subsidy and land grant, but the persons who undertake it will have to take the responsibility of raising the capital, and that will be expended to a large extent in the Dominion. There is another statement of my hon. friend on the left (Hon. Mr. Miller) to which I can scarcely assent, and that is, as I understood him, that the effect of this line will be to divert all or a great portion of the eastern trade across this line and he very forcibly and eloquently dwelt on the advantages of that traffic. He told us very properly that the people who possess the trade of the east generally rule the world in commercial matters. We should not mislead ourselves by anything that may turn out on experience to be mere assumption. We should not forget that the Suez Canal is in operation and that it has cut off two-thirds of the voyage from China and India to Europe, but still he is to a certain extent right, inasmuch as the tendency of this railway must be to attract a portion of this commerce. We have the advantage of crossing the American continent at its broadest part and necessarily shortening the sea voyage. It will be a line which must have very great advantages over any other in the United States or likely to be built. Then again we lie pretty nearly in a direct line between England and China. I have no hopes of an enormous traffic, possibly silks and the finest qualities of teas may be brought over, but the great bulk of the trade must still be carried on without transhipment. The Island of Vancouver is to the Pacific what Nova Scotia is to the Atlantic; and here I confess that the interest of my native Province lies deep in my heart at this moment. We believe this is to a very large extent a Nova Scotia question. Every mile of railway west of Halifax is of the greatest consequence to that city—it can never be

a matter of indifference to the people of Nova Scotia that the projected scheme, when carried out, may make Halifax the New York of British America. Therefore, we, who come from Nova Scotia, feel a deep interest in this question, and I am well assured that their votes to-day will show that they appreciate its importance. My hon. friend from the Wellington Division has put it to us very strongly why has not this resolution introduced in the Commons been incorporated into the address. If he refers to the Union Act, he will see that the two addresses from British Columbia and from the Dominion must be identical. Besides the British Columbia delegate is here, and I assume he, as well as his people, are satisfied with this modification of the terms; they ought to be, for what more could they reasonably ask than the pledge that the railway will be constructed in the most expeditious manner consistent with the nature of the country and a due regard to the financial exigencies of the Dominion. If not they can send another address to the Queen, objecting to the change, and no proclamation will be issued. This view ought to satisfy the reason and scruples of every hon. member, (hear, hear.) We are told by the member from the Wellington Division that Great Britain is about to leave us to ourselves; but on the authority of what British statesmen does he base such a statement. He may gather the scattered utterances of some of the Manchester School, but he cannot prove that what he asserts is the policy of the statesmen or the people of England. I would tell him that, so far from its being the policy of England, it is the very reverse. Has she not been protecting us all along? Has she not been assisting in guarding our fisheries from the encroachment of foreigners? Do we not see her even contending in Council for the headlands line which we claim in connection with these fisheries. It is but right when a public man makes such sweeping assertions he should be able to justify them by reference to some authority. The Dominion certainly is not aggressive—all we desire is peace with our neighbors—we have no fear of aggression on their part. With a considerable portion of their own people in a chronic state of dissatisfaction, they cannot afford to make any attack upon us; so that in their existing circumstances we have the best guarantee of peace. Would that I could impress these views upon those who are fighting our diplomatic battles at Washington. We make no defence, but simply ask to be allowed to carry on our own business, and work out our own destiny, while we cultivate the arts of peace and friendly commercial

intercourse with all the world. I confess that I have every confidence in the future of this Dominion. With an enlightened system of immigration, with the improvement of the Inland Navigation of the country, including the St. Lawrence which is the natural outlet of this vast basin and drained by its tributaries, with a wise, prudent and economical administration of public affairs, I have no fear that we shall not continue to prosper as a happy and united people (applause.)

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS—The mover of the amendment to the present resolutions, having severely criticised them in a speech delivered in French, I feel bound to answer in the same language. The first complaint of the Hon. Senator for Grandville, is that there is in the present resolutions a violation of the constitution by the fact of giving to British Columbia a larger representation than she is entitled to by her population, and consequently a dereliction from eastern interest to the advantage of the western. I will undertake to prove that such is not the case. At the conference held in Quebec in 1864, it was agreed that in the Lower House the representation would be based on population, but that in the Upper House, there would be equality between the two large Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and that the three Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would form a group, and would be entitled as such to an equal number of representatives in the second House, that is to say, twenty-four for the three—it being understood that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would have ten each, and Prince Edward Island four. These preliminaries, to a certain extent, had been established at a previous meeting held at Charlottetown, and at which, Newfoundland was not represented. At Quebec, this last colony had sent two delegates, and provision had been made for her representation in the Federal Parliament, if she choose to join Confederation and it had, moreover, been agreed that in that case she should be entitled to four Senators irrespective of those of the other Provinces, and this the British North America Act shows clearly and plainly. This was certainly changing the equilibrium first established, and it was the same principle that has been applied to Manitoba, and is now sought to be applied with regard to British Columbia. The arrangements made respecting the number of Senators for the Maritime Provinces, was to be altered when Newfoundland should enter the Union, and it is certainly just that what was to be done, in favor of the eastern colonies, should also be done for the Western ones when they enter the Union. So, I think that the hon. member

Hon. Mr. Dickey.

has no good ground of complaint, because the Government has agreed to give two Senators to Manitoba, and three to British Columbia. If this policy was good with respect to the Maritime Provinces, it was equally good with respect to the western colonies who wished to enter Confederation. It has been said that agreeing to give six members of the House of Commons, and three Senators to British Columbia, was giving her more than she was entitled to. Well, I admit that it is so for the present, but I say that it is not really an injustice towards the other Provinces if we look to the future of that colony, and if we look to its vast territory, where immigrants will certainly resort in large numbers before many years. If we had given her only the exact number of representatives to which her actual population would have entitled her, it would have been an injustice towards her, because the basis of representation will not be changed for ten years hence, and there is no question that before that time her population will be vastly increased. By the present arrangement, and by giving three Senators to British Columbia and two to Manitoba, the western Provinces would have one Senator more than the eastern ones if Newfoundland was in the Union. When the terms of Confederation were discussed and agreed to in 1863, the Maritime Provinces were represented at the Conference by men fully able to guard their interests, and it was well understood that a real confederation could not be established without at the same time uniting the different Provinces by easy means of communication, and it was then agreed that the Intercolonial Railway should be constructed, and commenced within six months. Well, the same principle must apply with regard to union with British Columbia. The circumstances of the case are that we have invited that colony to join us; delegates have been sent to confer upon the terms of union; her geographical position was well known, and no one would think of bringing her into our Confederation without affording her people means of communication with the larger Provinces which invited her to join them. British Columbia has not dictated the terms and conditions of her union with Canada, as that honourable member was pleased to say yesterday, but we have objected to and amended the terms proposed by her and the changes have been accepted by her delegates. With regard to the construction of the railway I will show that the conditions embodied in the resolutions—which are in keeping with the policy already followed by the Government when they agreed to

construct the Intercolonial Railway—are much more favourable to Canada than would have been the acceptance of the proposition made by British Columbia. In the first instance, here is that proposition: "Inasmuch as no real Union can subsist between this colony and Canada without the speedy establishment of communication across the Rocky Mountains by coach road and railway, the Dominion shall, within three years of the date of Union, construct and open for traffic such coach road from such point on the line of the Main Trunk Road of this Colony to Fort Garry, of similar character to the said Main Trunk Road; and shall further engage to use all means in her power to complete such railway communication at the earliest practicable date, and that surveys to determine the proper line for such railway shall be at once commenced; and a sum of not less than one million dollars shall be expended in every year, from and after three years from the date of union, in actually constructing the initial sections of such railway from the seaboard of British Columbia, to connect with the railway system of Canada." Such was the condition proposed by British Columbia, but the Government would not agree to it, although we substituted therefor another proposition having the same object in view, that is, the construction of a railway to the Pacific, but without the coach road. This railway, as honourable members are aware, is to be constructed in the space of ten years, and begun within two years after union. So, instead of two roads, only one is to be constructed. The time has been limited to ten years, because when the delegates found that they could not have the coach road made, they insisted upon fixing a certain time for the completion of the railway, and the period of ten years was accordingly agreed to. During the first two years after union, the proper surveys and explorations will be made, so that we may ascertain the best route to be followed, and then proceed to the construction of the road as economically as the circumstances will admit. Hon. members have discussed this subject as if the immediate construction of the railroad was under consideration, and as if we were called upon to vote a sum of money to that effect, but I think the resolutions now submitted do not bear that construction. The matter of fact is that we do not engage to construct the road at all, but that we are only asked to ratify certain conditions agreed to between the Government and the delegates for the admission of British Columbia into Union with Canada, and amongst others, that a railway shall be built at a future time. This is the only question now before the

House: and before the railway is commenced, the House will be called upon to give its opinion on its advisability, and to accept or reject the scheme.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Does not this engagement to construct the railway form part of the "treaty" entered upon with British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS—The "engagement" entered upon is the carrying out of the scheme of Union with the condition of the construction of the railway.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Another member of the Government has said that the road would be constructed by the Canadian Government.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS—I will not deny that this may have been said, but I will say that if a member of the Government has said so, he has made a mistake, for the intention of the Government is and has always been to have the road constructed by a private Company with the help of the Government, and it is the only way it can be made. The road will be constructed by means of grants of land and a subsidy in money, and nothing else. The hon. member said yesterday, that it was too soon to begin the road, because we know nothing of the country through which it is to pass. Well, I think I have clearly demonstrated that if we really wish British Columbia to be united with us, we must establish means of communication between that country and Canada. It is in the interest of both, and it is in the interest of the whole Confederation. It is for the Government to judge of what is in the interest of the Dominion, and they think that the sooner the road is constructed, the better it will be for the public interest; but there is no foundation whatever for the assertion made yesterday in this House that the delegates from British Columbia had dictated the terms respecting the construction of this road. The conditions offered were found to be just and reasonable, and in the interest of both parties, and they were agreed to by mutual consent, but there was no dictation of terms by them—and such a dictation would not have been submitted to by us. I repeat that the construction of the road is a matter of importance. It has been said also that there is no immediate necessity for the construction of the road to the Pacific, but I am of a contrary opinion, for it may be safely predicted that when the Northern American Pacific Railway is completed, with a branch reaching the Canadian boundary at Pembina, and I have recently read in a newspaper that the said branch will be completed during the present year, a certain class of emigrants will pour into British territory,

which it is not our interest to have. What has taken place in Texas will be repeated in this instance, and we all know that Texas was wrung from Mexico by the influx of emigrants, who went there in such numbers as to create a majority adverse to the Mexican rule, and it is to prevent a similar result that it is important that we should have a road of our own to carry thither our own people. I will ask permission of the Senate to read extracts from a pamphlet I have in my hand, by which it will be seen what is the feeling of the Americans on this subject: "The Northern Pacific railway is advantageously situated for the early development of a very extensive area, reaching far into the British possessions on the North, and presenting a clear field to the South of millions of acres of land adjacent to it, to be made a feeder to this line by means of a branch road. The valley of the Red River, which runs almost due North into Canada, embracing one of the finest wheat regions in the world, will of itself for ever ensure to the Eastern end of the road a profitable trade; and the construction of a North and South railroad through the Red River Valley, connecting the main trunk with the region around Lake Winnipeg, will add largely to the business of the Northern Pacific line. The elevation of isothermal lines has shown that the Northern boundary of the United States, latitude 49°, an imaginary line, instead of being the Northern boundary of cultivable lands and habitable climate, runs South of a vast body of very superior quality of arable territory, only needing railroad facilities for its successful development. Extensive settlements are already there knocking at the door, asking American enterprise to open it and unite their commercial destinies with ours. The age of railroads has sealed the doom of political lines of demarcation, and the progress of events is gradually but surely disseminating on this continent the spirit of self-government, the sure offspring of increasing popular intelligence, which must eventually, and perhaps very soon, remove the frail barriers which now separate the United States and Canada as Governments; but whether the two countries shall or shall not unite speedily in efforts to develop the region lying along the present boundary on both sides between the two countries and thus practically remove it.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN—Does the hon. Senator coincide with those views?

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS—Certainly not, and it is precisely for that reason that I advocate the building of this our road. Well, hon. gentlemen, with views such as those expressed in this pamphlet, I must say that if the Government

of Canada had neglected the opportunity of acquiring British Columbia and the North West territories, and delayed to establish immediately a railway line of communication between those territories and the other Provinces of the Dominion, they would have been untrue to the people of this country and undeserving their confidence, but I am quite sure the people will ultimately approve what has been done with respect to this question of railway and union with British Columbia. As I have already said, the intention of the Government is to have this road constructed by private Companies, and to grant lands, therefor, and give a moderate subsidy in cash. There is nothing unusual nor impracticable in this scheme, for the Northern Pacific railway now being built in the United States from Duluth to the Pacific, is so constructed by means of grants of lands. The United States Government granted the Company lands amounting to 25,600 acres in the territories, and to one-half that amount, or 12,800 acres in each state through which the road passes. There has been no money grant, and what can be done in the United States can also be done on our side of the line for the same purpose. If our neighbours can thus construct a railway of 2,000 miles long by means of grants of land only, I ask why should we not be able to do the same, with an addition of a moderate subsidy in cash? And if an American Company finds it of its interest to make a branch railway to come to our own territory, why could we not construct one ourselves. By the construction of the railway now, the value of the lands will be increased, and by this means they will suffice for themselves to provide for its construction. British Columbia has agreed to grant fifteen million acres of land along the route, and there will be sufficient or nearly so for the construction of their part of the road. Immigrants will settle along the road, and thus it will prove a lasting benefit to British Columbia and Canada. Here is what we may expect from the arrangement entered into. The road is to be 2,500 miles long. Twenty miles on each side of the road, will make 64 million of acres. By giving a Company every alternate lot of twenty miles, the quantity given will be 32 millions of acres, which being put down at \$1 per acre, as estimated yesterday by the honourable Senator for Grenville, makes \$32,000,000; and if the Government grant also a cash subsidy, as has been said, of \$10,000 per mile of railway, this will amount to \$25,000,000, making an aggregate amount of \$57,000,000, leaving in the possession of the Government thirty-two millions of acres in their alternate lots.

Hon Mr. Chapais.

But I think that the lands granted will sell, on an average, at about \$1.50 per acre, making \$48,000,000, which, with the \$25,000,000 of money grant, will leave only \$27,000,000 to be furnished by the company or companies undertaking the construction of the railway, if estimated at \$100,000,000, and if at the cost of the Northern Pacific, \$21,000,000. Well, this is not an extravagant sum, and I think we can easily find companies to undertake the construction of the road at the condition mentioned. In corroboration of these opinions, I beg to submit the following extract:—The Illinois Central received a land grant of 2,595,000 acres, mainly treeless or waterless prairies. Sales from this grant up to January 1, 1869, amounted to \$23,793,255, including interest on deferred payments, and there remained unsold 526,690 acres worth \$10 per acre. In other words the Illinois Central's grant of 2,595,000 acres when all sold will have yielded the company fully \$30,000,000, an average of more than \$11 per acre, and more than the total cost of building the road.

Much has been said in connection with the building of the Intercolonial road, and much exaggeration has been indulged in. The scheme, it seems to me, is large enough in itself, and its opponents ought not to prejudice public opinion by adding imaginary figures to its real proportions. Here again I am in a position to show things in their true light. The Hon. Senator for Wellington, Hon. Mr. Sanborn, said yesterday that the Northern Pacific Railroad offered on this question a fair mode of comparison. Well it is exactly the official approximate estimate of the cost of that road that I am now going to consider. From Duluth on Lake Superior to Puget Sound on the Pacific, the distance is two thousand miles, divided into six sections, the cost of which respectively is given in detail and recapitulated as follows:

Grading, masonry, bridging, track and ballast.....	\$60,320,000
Sidings	4,200,000
Contingencies, including Superintendence and Engineering.....	5,000,000
Telegraph Line.....	600,000
Buildings	3,312,000
Rolling stock.....	3,615,000

Forming the amount of ..	\$76,047,000
To which is added interest on bonds over receipts during construction.....	7,230,000

Total..... \$83,277,000
Now if we apply those figures to our own road, which is

500 miles longer, and add for that purpose the apportionate amount, viz:.. 20,814,250

The exact figure to which we arrive is.....	\$104,091,250
Less 10 per 100 discount on American money, in round number.....	10,091,250

We have the real approximate cost of the road..... \$94,000,000

The honourable member for Toronto (Hon. Mr. McPherson) said yesterday that there was nothing in the resolutions to commit us to the construction of the whole length mentioned by me, but that we would only be bound to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada, and that it could be done through the American Pacific Railway when built from Pembina to Fort Garry. Well, I do not deny that this would be a proper way to make a temporary connection, but only until it would be possible for us to have a road of our own on our territory. The construction of the road from Fort Garry to the Rocky Mountains is admitted to be an easy task, but the route from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific coast has been made a bugbear of to deter the members of this House from voting for the resolutions. I know that the part of the route west of the Rocky Mountains is difficult to overcome; but I know also that the easiest pass through those mountains is to be found on our territory. The Yellow Head pass is comparatively easy and is only 3,600 feet above the sea, and it is so easy that when the gold fields of British Columbia were discovered, a party of more than one hundred emigrants, with baggage and live stock, went through it, and only found that they had crossed it when they were on the other side, and they reached Fraser river without any impediment or trouble. The distance from Fort Garry to the Rocky Mountains, 1,125 miles, is of an easy character, and the 600 miles following through the sea of Mountains, (as it has been called) is difficult, but much less so on our side than on the American territory, where two lines are being constructed. As for the argument advanced that emigrants might use the American railway to reach Fort Garry and the Pacific, I must say that if it was found impossible to construct a road of our own, it would certainly be an advantage to use it, but if that construction is possible, as I am quite convinced it is, it would be far more in our interest to build it and control it than to be dependant on a line held by strangers. The still fresh remembrance of the impression produced on me by the reading of a cer-

tain document of recent date, and emanating from a kind neighbour has strongly impressed that necessity on my mind. The argument adduced that it was proposed to construct a road through an unknown country, the difficulties of which would be insuperable in my opinion has but very little weight. I think that we may say that there is now nothing impossible to railway engineers of the present day. When we see that within ten years a tunnel has been pierced through the Alps for the passage of a railway, at an immense cost, and that during the progress of the boring of the reputed insuperable wall, the construction of a railroad has allowed the daring engine to awake the echoes of the undisturbed solitude of the Simplon, we may say that the construction of a Pacific Railway through the Rocky Mountains is a comparatively easy task. As for the climate and the nature of the soil of British Columbia, I can prove that they are most favourable to colonization. Here is what I find on these subjects in the report of the Engineer of the Central Pacific Road, already quoted. "The summer isothermal line of 70° reaches the Valley of the Saskatchewan about latitude 51° . The same isothermal passes through Chicago, Cleveland, Harrisburgh and Pennsylvania, on this continent, and through Southern France, Lombardy, and the great wheat growing districts of Southern Russia. These valuable Canadian territories, which, for the want of adequate investigation, have hitherto been regarded as valueless, are destined within a reasonable period to to perform an important part in the progress of agriculture and commerce on this continent. Lines of latitude are no longer the sole guides in estimating the climatic characteristics or producing qualities of regions to the North, since experience has shown that the chilling effect of high latitude, so marked on the Atlantic coast, is obviated by the influence of the Pacific Ocean, and perhaps other causes not yet thoroughly elaborated or understood. Because the Rocky Mountains intervene between Canada and British Columbia, it must not be inferred that the whole colony is of the same character as those Mountains, and is unfit for colonization purposes. When, for instance, a traveller visits the Saguenay river and looks at its high rocky walls, he cannot conceive that the country behind is of such a splendid character as it has proved to be, round Lake St. John and elsewhere. Well, it is the same with British Columbia and the territories north of Lake Superior, for the whole length of the road, and I have proved that once the Rocky Mountains are passed, the country is as favourable as any

part of Canada with respect to climate, soil, timber, &c. Referring again to the route of the Pacific road, I firmly believe that an easy passage will be found on proper surveys being made. I may mention as the result of surveys in parts of the country better known than the Rocky Mountains, and the region between Fort Garry and Lake Temiscaming, that part of the country, which has been so long settled, the Temiscouata road, which was used for fifty years as the only means of inland communications between Canada and New Brunswick, had been established on "a sea of mountains," and nobody knew of a better route. But when later engineers explored the country, they found a perfectly level tract and this route is now followed. The same may be said of the road between Quebec and lake St. John. Up to a recent date, it was thought that the country between Quebec and Lake St. John, was so broken and hilly that no practicable road could be built, and an exploration party sent by the honourable member opposite me (Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just) while he was in the Government reported unfavourably on the subject and the party themselves were on the verge of perishing by famine and hunger, but for the timely assistance they received from some bushmen they met in the woods. Well, some time after my entering the Government, a gentleman came to me and assured me of the existence of a favourable route for the construction of a road. I was at first disinclined to spend any more money for that purpose, after the results of three previous surveys, but the gentleman spoke so confidently that I at last consented to authorize another trial,—and, I must say, that the survey was highly successful and resulted in the construction of the present beautiful road to Lake St. John. The name of the man who had found the route is Jean Gagnon, and I feel much pleasure in publicly acknowledging the services he has thus rendered to the whole Province of Quebec. In view of these facts I have not the least doubt that an easy passage will yet be found for the Pacific Railway through that section not actually known to travellers and unsurveyed. The section between the Lake of the Woods and Temiscaming. As proof of my opinion and in vindication of the action of the Government in this most important transaction, I feel authorized to quote a few more extracts of an excellent work recently published on "The Red River Country," by Alexander G Russell, C A., to show that even this last section represented as "terra incognita" is not so much so as alleged. Speaking of "A Railroad to Red

Hon. Mr. Chapais.

River by the Valley of the Ottawa," the writer says :

"The probability of a direct railroad route being formed by the valley of the Ottawa to Red River, has been to a great degree confirmed, as already mentioned by the recent survey of the Montreal River, a tributary which joins the Ottawa in Lake Temiscaming.

Eon. Mr. SKEAD—Hear. hear. This is the important route.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS—This route, for a railway to the Pacific, was, I believe, first proposed by Colonel Carmichael Smith, probably from information obtained from officers of the Hudson's Bay Company."

"Strictly speaking, a straight line from Montreal to Fort Garry would touch the northerly bays of Lake Superior, near Pic Island; and the country along the shore of the Lakes, well known to be mountainous and unsuitable for a railway line; but as it is known the country behind is more favourable, and as the length of the line would not be increased in any appreciable degree by carrying it forty miles further north; but on the contrary, probably be slightly diminished, by having much fewer minor sinuosities from being in better ground, it is assumed that our route would be carried there.

"This character of the country which has long been well known to the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, and has been confirmed as far as recent surveys of the northerly waters of the Ottawa have extended, is referred to by Provincial Surveyor Herrick, in his report of his exploratory survey in the country north of Lake Superior.

He says:—"From enquiries made amongst the Indians, as well as from the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, who have travelled much through the country, I am informed that after from thirty to fifty miles of hilly country, round Lake Superior, is passed, a level country is reached, which extends from the height of land between Lake Superior and the Red River settlement east for several hundred miles and along the north of the sources of the tributaries of the Ottawa, that if at any future period it may be proposed to connect Canada with the Red River settlement by railroad, it does not appear that much difficulty will be experienced on this part of the route." The same description of the intervening country has long been given by officers of the Hudson's Bay Company, stationed on the northern waters of the Ottawa.

"In the unsurveyed region before mentioned, the greatest difficulty will probably be encountered between the river

Nipigon and Lac Leul, in the rise to the watershed: but that is necessarily less than five hundred feet or not more than will be met on the Intercolonial Railway before getting twenty miles from the St. Lawrence.

"These details are gone into so fully because it is not generally known that we have a favourable and most direct route to Red River shorter than any other can be."

"Therefore, if we do not have a railway through our own territory to Red River, it certainly will not be because we have not a favourable route for it, but for want of sufficient inducements or necessity for making it.

"The level clay country of the North, through which this route passes, seemingly for four hundred miles, presents as yet, no inducement, whatever to open it. But when the navigation of the Ottawa is improved, as far the Mattawan two hundred miles above the Capital a comparative small expenditure will carry it hundreds of miles further, to the head of Lake Temiscaming. This will entirely change the prospect of settlement not only of the good Lands there but also eventually of the clay country beyond it, should the soil of that great extent of entirely arable lands, prove as capable of improvement by cultivation as other clay soils are."

"It is difficult to conceive that a country fully equal to Finland with the great water system of the Ottawa leading directly to it should remain for ever valueless and uninhabited." In spite of the lengthy but important extracts already quoted, I cannot refrain from submitting to you the two following and last ones: I was informed by that experienced officer, Provincial Surveyor Salter that on making an examination Northward beyond the end of his line of survey near latitude 48° North he entered the level clay country of the north, at about twenty four miles north of his line of survey, and found the surface very gently undulating and covered with a fair growth of tall maple, birch and spruce trees,—the upturned roots showing a soil entirely free from stones. From an eminence before entering it there were no hills visible Northward, as far as he could explore the horizon with his telescope, and the change from the rugged sterile country and poor growth of woods traversed by the exploring lines run by him and Mr. Sinclair nearly on the parallel of lat. 48° North to the luxuriant woods of level country, was very striking."

This actual verification of the position and character of the level clay country of the North, midway between the Montreal Railway or West branch of the Ottawa and Lake Superior, is so far very important,

confirming, by connexion with definite survey, the fact that we have there a good country for a railway line and also for settlement.

"The Geological Survey of Lake Nipigon confirms and corrects the report of its great extent given by Mr. Armstrong. The area of its surface is equal to two-thirds of Lake Ontario. As far as is known by the survey of its shores—about 500 miles of circuit—nearly half of the land on it seems arable; and the presence of trap rock indicates a rich soil,—adding much to the extent of land known to be fit for settlement on the proposed direct line of railroad to Red River."

The undertaking of that road is not beyond the means of Canada, far less now than was the undertaking of other large public works some fifteen or twenty years ago. Canada has already carried out works far more costly and important than any other country having the same population, and as she is now much stronger than she was when she undertook those works, I think that she may safely go on in her career of progress and advance. This is the only way by which we may hope to preserve the existence of British rule in Canada, and by which we may hope to live and die under the glorious British Flag.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN.—In view of the length of time which this debate has already occupied, I do not propose to trespass upon the attention of the House for more than a few minutes, especially as I cannot hope to throw any additional light on the subject, or to add anything of importance to what has already been said in reference to these resolutions. However, in a matter involving such important interests—affecting not merely one section but the whole Dominion, and especially the Province with which I am more immediately connected, I am reluctant to give a silent vote, and shall, therefore, ask your indulgence for a few moments whilst I state very briefly the considerations which induce me to support the resolutions and vote against the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Grandville. In the first place I consider the annexation of British Columbia as absolutely necessary to complete the great work of Confederation—a work in which all those who took part in it have reason to feel no small pride. Of all the acts of the public men of this country, irrespective of party, I know of none to which they may look back with more pride and satisfaction than to those measures which have so far successfully resulted in laying the foundations of a great British North American nationality on this continent. I am aware that there are many able

and honest men, both in Canada and the Maritime Provinces, who were opposed to Confederation at the outset, but with scarcely an exception all of them have now accepted the situation, and have shown their readiness to direct their best energies to strengthen and build up the new Dominion. Those who from the first have taken an active part in supporting Confederation have every reason to feel satisfied at the results which have been already attained. Any unprejudiced person looking back to what has taken place since 1867 cannot but acknowledge, that great and increasing prosperity has marked the course of the Dominion since that period. The trade between the Inland and Maritime Provinces has been developed to a wonderful extent, and we have every reason to hope that it will assume immense proportions, and the result of Confederation, so far, instead of being a source of ruin and bankruptcy, as some of its opponents were so fond of prophesying, has been a gradual but steady increase in the trade and commerce and the national prosperity of the whole Dominion. But I do not look upon the improvement in our national condition as the only important result proceeding from Confederation. There are other conditions which I view as of equal, if not greater, importance. No reflecting man, looking upon our geographical position in reference to the powerful republic on our southern borders, and considering the many changes which have taken place both in the circumstances of the country and in our relations towards the Mother Country, but must repeatedly have asked himself within the past few years, what is to be the future of Canadians and their descendants on this continent? I venture to affirm that it is the earnest hope and wish of the vast majority of the people of this country that the connection which has so long subsisted between us and the glorious Empire of which we form a part, may long continue as it is now (cheers). But if the time ever does arrive when we shall have grown out of that state, it will, I am persuaded, be *equally* the earnest wish of all the people of the Dominion, that we should then preserve our distinct national independence as a British American Confederation [hear, hear]—a Confederation composed of a people whose descendants, we may hope, will exhibit some of the best characteristics of the races from which they have sprung—of the cool-headed, persevering Englishman, the "canny" Scot, the warm, impulsive Irishman, and the gallant sons of brave old France, (cheers),—the whole forming a nationality which shall be able to preserve its identity and independence

Hon. Mr. Chapais.

on this Continent, and continue for generations to come, as a happy and prosperous people. There are some, I know, who look upon such aspirations as visionary, and who do not participate in them, but I believe they are very few, and that the great majority of the people of this country, consider the building up of a great British American Confederation as an object worthy of earnest and patriotic men, whether in or out of Parliament, and that all our policy and legislation should be shaped with that end in view. If these things be so, then no one can doubt that the admission of British Columbia into the Dominion is an actual necessity, that without it the work of Confederation would be altogether incomplete and our position on this Continent would be both politically and commercially much less secure and advantageous. Listening attentively to the debate, it appeared to me that the only really serious stumbling block which has presented itself to the minds of the honourable members, is the construction of what has been variously called the Trans-Continental, the Inter-Oceanic, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it also appears to me after the best consideration I am able to give this subject, that the obstacles in the way of the successful accomplishment of this great enterprise are not so formidable as to be beyond our powers of surmounting them and that some of the difficulties suggested have been entirely the creation of hon. gentlemen's own imagination. One would suppose from what has been said by the opponents of these resolutions, that if they are carried, we are to rush blindly into the construction of the Pacific Railway without any regard to expense, or the possible burthens which may be imposed upon this country—that we were going into it rashly and without taking time to devise the most economical as well as the most speedy method of carrying it out. It seems to me that there is nothing in these resolutions to justify the conclusions at which some of my hon. friends have arrived. The time must come when we shall have a railway across the Continent, entirely through British Territory, and complete and direct communication with our Canadian system of railways, but while working to that end why should we not make use of all means within our reach to establish a railway connection with the North West and British Columbia, at the earliest possible day and at the least possible expense. If the American railways afford us any facilities or advantages in doing so, I do not see why we should not make use of them. My hon. friend on my left (Mr. Macpherson) has pointed out that by availing ourselves of the Am-

erican lines of railway touching our borders at Pembina, and making the eastern terminus of our own railway for the present to connect with them, we can then build the road from Fort Garry westward, and thus establish communication with British Columbia at a comparatively reasonable cost, and without imposing any excessive burdens upon the Dominion. My hon. friend, I am sure, did not, for a moment, intend to be understood as suggesting the abandonment of a direct line entirely through our own territory, but simply that for the present we should avail ourselves of any facilities within our reach, to carry out substantially one of the principal objects of these resolutions, and while doing so, afford ample time and opportunity for exploring and deciding upon the best route for what is confessedly the most difficult part of the whole line, viz: that part of it between Ontario and Fort Garry.

Therefore, honourable gentlemen, it appears to me that if this great work is undertaken in the careful and prudent manner in which I think it may be done, the only really serious difficulty in the proposed scheme for the admission of British Columbia into the Union is done away with and whatever may be the difference of opinion in respect to other conditions of the union the objections do not appear to me to be of sufficient force to warrant the rejection. I have great faith in the future of this Dominion, with our fertile soil, our mineral riches, our vast forests, our extensive fisheries; and a population rapidly increasing in numbers and wealth I have no fear but that our resources will be developed to an extent quite sufficient to enable us to meet all our engagements heavy though they may be. I do not say that we have any right to look forward to a career of uninterrupted prosperity; unfavourable seasons, bad harvests, and occasional depressions in trade, may every now and then interpose a temporary check to our prosperity; but we have no reason to anticipate that it will be more than a temporary check.

Last evening an honourable gentleman opposite from New Brunswick read a long extract from one of Sydney Smith's letters in which that witty divine expatiated very bitterly on the worthlessness of Pennsylvanian bonds and American securities in general, and the honourable gentleman taking that as his text, prophesied that if we passed these resolutions the time would come when some future Sidney Smith, should in like manner bemoan himself over worthless Dominion securities and British Columbian bonds! Well, honorable gentlemen are no doubt all familiar with Lord Macaulay's imaginary

"New Zealander" sitting amid ruin and desolation, on one of the broken arches of London Bridge, and contemplating the remains of St. Paul's Cathedral and other famous edifices of the once metropolis of the world ! but London still stands ; and I would fain hope that the honourable gentleman's fore-cast of the future, may take as long to fulfil as Lord Macaulay's, and that the passage of these resolutions, instead of having the baneful effects which he anticipates, will prove but another step in advance in the material prosperity and political power of the whole Dominion.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR—It appears to me that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has forgotten to consider the question of the cost of this scheme of Union, and the heavy burthens which it must necessarily entail upon the country. The Postmaster General, who spoke at considerable length on this question, and placed the matter in the best light he could, referred to the advantages of railway communication, and stated that the country had completed a railway system which had cost \$160,000,000. That was entirely new to me—I am not aware that Canada has ever completed such a system; but I do know that \$20,000,000 were advanced as a loan to certain railway companies, and this sum still remains unpaid up to this moment. My hon. friend has also stated in a very positive manner that the country is abundantly able to construct the proposed railway; and the hon. gentleman went back to the history of this country from the Union of the Canadas, when there was a debt of over \$5,000,000. I will not follow my hon. friend so far back as 1841—I can show, however, that there has been a rapid increase of debt and that our assets amount really to nothing. I will follow my hon. friend to 1854, which was an eventful period in the history of this Country—it was the time of the formation of the Cartier-Macdonald coalition—it was also a time when nearly all the public improvements of this country, including the Canals and Railways, were completed. In 1854, our debt, direct and indirect, was \$38,000,000. At the date of Confederation our debt was \$73,390,000 showing an average increase of \$2,500,000 a year for twelve years, at a time, too, when comparatively little money was being expended for public improvements. This shows that the Government were really borrowing to pay current expenses and interest. The same state of things has continued since Confederation—the average increase is \$10,000,000 a year. The total debt is now at least \$100,000,000.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—No, more like \$80,000,000.

Hon. Mr. Chapais.

Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR—It is at least \$100,000,000. Some say it is nearer \$120,000,000. There has also been a large increase of taxation since the period of 1854, and the Dominion has really little or nothing in the shape of productive assets to show for its enormous debt. Under these circumstances, I would like to know how this road to the Pacific is to be constructed, for it will cost from \$100,000,000 to 150,000,000 which must be provided out of the revenues of this country, ("No, No," from the government benches.) It must be remembered, too, that since Confederation, we have agreed to build the Intercolonial Railway—the Railways in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are all Government works, which we have to keep up at a large cost to the exchequer. How is the revenue to be increased to meet these liabilities? During the last session we saw how difficult it was to impose a small tax on coal and other articles. The measure was stoutly resisted. I gave my support to the Government on the question because I thought they really required the revenue. During the present session they have been actually forced to repeal the tax, in the very face of undertaking an expenditure of nearly \$150,000,000. If these resolutions are passed the faith of the Government will be pledged to the payment of the cost of constructing the road, the resolutions will have become law, and the Government will be bound by them. You must then chose one of two evils—you must carry out the law, or repudiate your legal obligations. As respects the amount of money which is to be handed over to British Columbia, I refer to the \$100,000 a year in prospective, it really amounts to a capital of two millions of dollars, for the purchase of lands of which we know nothing, of which there has been no survey or exploration. We are certainly proceeding in the dark. So far as we know only a small portion of the lands in British Columbia are fit for purposes of cultivation. Already free grants of land have been offered, but the country nevertheless is not settled. The truth is that you cannot form settlements, because there is so small a proportion of the lands fit for cultivation. Even admitting that one-third is fit for cultivation any person who knows anything about the land is aware that they are not accessible. We may literally hand over this sum of \$100,000 for a worthless purchase. I have been long in the Legislature, and have paid some attention to the management of Crown Lands in Canada. Notwithstanding the fine quality of the lands, did they ever yield a revenue. The cost of management absorbed all the receipts from this source.

I am quite willing to admit that the timber latterly under better management, has afforded some revenue, but the receipts from land were literally frittered away in expenses. If you could not derive a revenue from the fertile lands of Ontario, how can you expect to do so from this miserable region in the West. (Hear.) Hon. gentlemen may cry "hear, hear," but I think after experience what I have said will be found to be the fact. Lately we have offered a large quantity of lands both in Ontario and Quebec as free grants—lands much superior to those of the inaccessible regions in question, and yet you cannot get them sold or settled as free grants. The Huron districts and the Owen Sound settlements are flourishing because the lands were fertile and there was a large extent of country to select from. Those who talk about settling this western country are hardly awake to what they are saying. Some years ago there was a great rush to the country to prospect for gold and minerals; but all that excitement has died away, and mining is now pursued only to a small extent. It is true there is a considerable area of good land in Manitoba—and according to Professor Hind, some 40 or 50,000,000 of acres in the Saskatchewan country. Already, however, a large portion of the lands about Fort Garry have been given away. Under all the circumstances I cannot believe that the railway can be, even when built, of any great advantage to the Dominion. As respects the question of representation I cannot see the fairness in giving some 10,000 whites, represented as being of wasteful and extravagant habits, three members in the Senate whilst Ontario, with two millions, representing a sturdy yeomanry, an industrious population, not a people of wasteful and extravagant habits, has only 24 members in the same branch. The whole plan is subversive of that principle of representation by population which was one of the great inducements to Ontario to come into the Confederation. The financial terms are equally unjust and disproportionate to the population, and I cannot certainly record my vote in favor of a measure which my judgment cannot approve of. It may be said that I opposed this measure because I opposed Confederation. I opposed that scheme in every stage but when it became the constitution of the country, I accepted it and was willing to give it my support. I still believe that the measure has given a disproportionate share to the Maritime Provinces, as compared with Ontario, but still I would work it out honestly and in good faith. But when I am asked to go still further and embark in rash, mad projects, I must pause. Under these circumstances, I have no other alter-

native than to state that I shall give my vote in favor of the amendment for delay.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—As the junior member of this Hon. House and without any Parliamentary experience, I ask the indulgence of hon. members for a few moments. Since these resolutions came up, I have thought over them very seriously—I have asked myself what effect they could have upon myself, upon my neighbour and upon every individual in the land. In order to get at this, I put down the number of acres of land and the money with which we propose to build this great road, which will be, say 2,500 miles long; \$30,000 a mile would build it and make the total cost \$75,000,000. I said then, where are these seventy-five millions to come from; but I see that the Government have promised to give 64,000,000 acres of land to assist the construction of the road, and I suppose that it will be worth from 70 to 80 cents an acre, but saying 75 cents, the value of the total grant may be put down at \$48,000,000 or \$50,000,000 for a little over 95 cents. Then the Government propose to give \$10,000 per mile or \$25,000,000 as a subsidy, which added to the value of the land will meet the estimated cost of the whole work. I looked at this question in a manner peculiar to myself, I asked what burthen will this bring upon me? I take the total number of inhabitants in our Dominion and calculated so much per head, and I find that probably two years from this time, when the surveys will be completed, the population will be 5,000,000. I calculate 50 cts per head per annum for ten years would build the road or give the \$10,000 per mile, or \$25,000,000 altogether. It has been said by those who are opposed to this scheme that \$25,000,000 will not be sufficient for the Government to give. Now, I consider that \$25,000 per mile would be a pretty good amount to build a railway which will run through a portion of prairie land. Suppose we borrow the money, at the expiration of ten years, it would only cost 20 cents per head, divided among our population. But it is said that that sum will not build the road. Then looking at it in the worst possible light—supposing that the Government have to give \$50,000,000 and have fifteen years to do it in; for in my opinion, we are not tied down to the time of ten years, but simply promise to do all we can and to act in good faith—we would not have any very heavy burthen to bear. We would then be called upon to pay the enormous sum of \$1 per year per head for ten years to clear off the debt and build the road. Or suppose, from time to time we borrow the money, then, we will have to pay four per cent on the amount, instead of \$1 a year. In a prosperous country, like ours, we can easily raise all the money

necessary for the construction of this great work; and, therefore, I do not entertain the feelings of apprehensions that some hon. gentlemen have. Supposing the population increases during the next 10 or 15 years 50 per cent.—in my opinion, it will increase during the present decade as it has not increased during the past twenty years—the whole burthen imposed upon our people would not exceed 30 cents per head. With these views and taking the matter seriously into consideration, I consider it is my duty, irrespective of political considerations, to give this measure my support (hear, hear). I believe this is one of the most important votes that I shall be called upon to give for a long time to come, since the question before us is inseparably connected with the union of the Provinces. Let hon. gentlemen for one moment consider the extent of the colony now applying for admission—a country as large as England and two or three times as large and fertile as Ireland—and they will see its value to the Dominion. This measure proposes to open up a great Western nation—to construct a highway between the Atlantic and the Pacific—to give the European emigrant the means of making a comfortable home for himself and family in a rich country—to develop resources which are now inactive and unproductive. With these results accruing from the measure, I cannot believe that we need be alarmed as to the future. On the contrary, I believe that we belong to a prosperous and progressive nation which will never feel this expenditure. If this measure failed to be carried out, years might elapse before we would be in so favourable a position as now to make a commencement. Imagine a chain being run across the continent. Let the Nova Scotians take the links of that chain and join together all the sections. I believe that it is necessary for the consolidation of British America that we should pass the resolutions, for without them the Government will have no power to order a survey or explore the country. I trust to-night when the vote is taken that we will shew that we fully appreciate the importance of the question. We pledge ourselves to the particular mode of construction, as stated by the Government, but if we find we cannot do it within the next ten years, in the way proposed, then they must come back to the House, and ask for additional legislation on the subject; and the answer would be: “You have acted faithfully and we will renew the bargain.” Therefore, I ask the hon. members of this House, especially our friends from Nova Scotia, to take the matter into their most serious consideration and assist in the work of

strengthening the Union and developing the resources of the whole Dominion. At the present moment, when we are endeavouring to induce a flow of immigration into this country, this measure of progress will have great effect—it will attract capital, enterprize and population into the undeveloped and rich territories of the West. The moment the surveys are ended people will commence to come into the country and take a share in the prosperity of the Dominion. It is for the good of mankind that these rich fertile lands should be opened up to the poor people of the over-crowded communities of the old world—who live in cellars, garrets and hovels, hardly able to find mere subsistence. Let us unite heartily to make this Union a success, and build up a great and prosperous nation in our land (cheers).

Hon. Mr. HOLMES said that the sentiments he had just heard commended themselves to his good judgment. He too believed that unless British Columbia was admitted into the Confederation, that great scheme could never be considered in a fair way towards completion. He was among those who believed Union inseparably connected with our prosperity, and wished to see it extended to the shores of the Pacific. He was an advocate of all measures of progress—of public works which would stimulate the development of our resources. He had now been many years in the country and had watched its gradual progress towards its present condition of prosperity. He had often heard before these predictions of ruin and bankruptcy, and was not now to be terrified by the bugbear which the Opposition was raising in order to influence members against the resolutions. He believed the large grant of land together with the subsidy given by the Government would be quite sufficient to build the whole road. He was surprised to hear the objections urged by some gentlemen, but it was quite sufficient for the Government to bring forward a measure to evoke the opposition of some hon. members. The House should not merely consider the money question, but how far the unity and progress of the Dominion were identified with the adoption of the scheme.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Before I give my vote on this subject, I wish to explain my reasons. I am not one who opposed the Confederation of the Provinces. I was always an advocate of the Union, because I believed it was going to benefit us. I believe that it is desirable that we should introduce into the Union, not only the North West Territory but British Columbia, but now that the question is before us, I cannot agree to all the terms under which that

Hon. Mr. Seymour.

colony is to come in. I am not going, however, to oppose the arrangement that has been made respecting the representation. I believe that it is no more liberal than the people are entitled to in view of their peculiar situation. So far as the financial arrangements are concerned, I am of opinion that when we take a new Province into Confederation, we must deal liberally with them. I expected that as New Brunswick was the least populous of the Provinces of the Dominion, she would have been more liberally dealt with; but, I regret to say, that my anticipations to some extent have been disappointed; but still, I am willing not to act towards the other colonies in the same way, but to give them every consideration to which they are fairly entitled. I do not think that the people of British Columbia had a right to expect, that this country would launch into such an undertaking as a Pacific Railway on their own account. Although we have been contrasted with the United States, we are not situated as they are. They have gone on adding State after State. Ohio was settled after New York, then Indiana, Illinois, and so on, until the tide of population crossed the Missouri. We have between the habitable parts of Canada and Red River, a region of 1000 miles of wilderness. We talk of giving land along this route, but if you take up the Canadian Almanac, and look at the map you will see that the Ontario Government have marked off blocks of land for free grants, and these are likely first to attract settlers, for they will be nearer the railways, cities and towns of Canada, being situated between the 45th and 46th degrees of north latitude. But what is the value of the land we now propose to offer for the construction of the railway, which lies two or three degrees further north. No one can expect that cereals or even vegetables will ripen on much of it. I admit that when we cross the Red River there is much valuable land, which anybody would be ready to take, together with the moderate subsidy spoken of by the Postmaster General; but supposing you had a railway built from Arnprior to Red River, what would you do with it. It could not pay its running expenses. Take the Grand Trunk Railway—it runs past Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Quebec, and other large towns, and enjoys not only an immense way traffic through the rich Province of Ontario but a large through traffic from the Western States; but what after all does it pay to its stockholders? What then could be expected from a road 1,000 miles long passing through a region that will furnish little or no way traffic, and with a through traffic of the most limited nature. I do not think we should delude

the people of British Columbia with promises which cannot be realized. I do not agree with these gentlemen, however, who say that these resolutions do not bind us—they undertake to pledge the Dominion to the commencement of the railway within two years. I believe that in British Columbia nineteen-twentieths of the people think that we intend to build the road within the time promised, but does anyone here entertain the opinion that it can be done—that any company will be found to undertake the work. It is folly for us to promise to construct such an enormous work for the sake of benefiting some 1,600 people. The people of the United States did not commence their Pacific Railway until they had wealthy and populous communities on the Pacific coast and noble States, teeming with activity, from the Ohio to the country beyond the Mississippi and the Missouri. More than that, there were upwards of 40,000,000 of people to assist the great work, instead of the 4,000,000 who live within the Confederation. The Americans would never have projected such a work for the benefit of only 16,000 souls. They had on the Pacific coast the populous State of California, abounding in mineral and agricultural resources, whose inhabitants were able and willing to extend their existing railway, and to meet the people of the East half way, as well as to give ample employment to the road when constructed, while we are asked to build a road nearly double the length of theirs, with no prospect of assistance to build it or of traffic to support it when built. I do not believe that our American neighbours have any idea of going to war with us. I believe it is their interest as much as ours to sustain friendly relations, and to reciprocate in many ways with each other. We reciprocate now so far as our railways are concerned—a great quantity of Western produce comes by the lines which converge on Sarnia—and we should follow their example in this respect. As soon as there are enough people in Manitoba we should continue a road from Pembina to Fort Garry, and as soon as circumstances would justify the undertaking, extend gradually towards the Pacific, utilizing the American roads for immigration. Instead of giving the people of British Columbia the \$100,000, I would capitalize it, and that would probably give them \$2,000,000 to spend in improving their communications. I would give the necessary amount for the support of the Postal arrangements and the Legislature. I would afford them facilities for intercourse with San Francisco. I would give the people of Red River a railway from Red River to Pembina, where connection with the

American system of railways will be made. I wish to deal fairly with these people, but not to promise more than we can or undertake to do. Under all the circumstances I cannot believe that the construction of the road is possible, and must vote against the terms embodied in the resolutions.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—When my hon. friend behind me, (Mr. Seymour) addressed the House on this subject he looked at the dark side, and I began to believe that I had been living for the last three or four years under an entire delusion as to our condition. I did believe that this Dominion was in a prosperous state and that all of us had every reason to be satisfied with the mode in which public affairs were being administered. Now I am told that I have been fostering a veritable delusion—that all this boasted prosperity of ours is purely fictitious. But despite the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I am quite content with the condition of public affairs and their management since the Confederation of British America; I have no doubt whatever that this country will go on prospering and that we will lay successfully the foundations of the new nationality. When I compare the state of things in 1821, when I first arrived here with what I now see around me—cities and towns increasing with great rapidity, wealth accumulating everywhere, public works stimulating the development of our resources, the whole country teeming with activity and enterprise—I am quite satisfied and congratulate myself that I live in Canada. When I consider the present scheme it does not strike me as it appears to have struck others, that we are going to bring ruin and bankruptcy on this country. I remember perfectly well, some 30 years ago, when we were paying some 2½ per cent on our importations; and when the public exigencies required that the duty should be raised to 5 per cent. we were told that the country was to be ruined. Subsequently the duty was raised to 7½ and the same excitement arose, and so it has gone on until we have reached our present tariff, and are more prosperous than when we only paid 2½ per cent. We are living in an age of progress and are carried onward by the spirit of the day—that restless spirit of enterprise which ever looks ahead. Last year the Government of Quebec offered large appropriations to railway companies, and these have been accepted by three. These companies propose to build their lines by means of these grants of land and some assistance from the municipalities; and I have every belief that they will succeed. In the case of the present road, I am quite sanguine that there will be no difficulty in inducing

Hon. Mr. Wark.

capitalists to undertake it. With the large grants offered, 20 miles on each side, I am much mistaken if before the next session of Parliament we shall not see a number of tenders submitted for the construction of that entire road (hear, hear), especially as there is to be a subsidy of \$10,000 a mile from the Government besides. The Northern Pacific road is now being constructed without any subsidy at all, and will be entirely built by means of grants of public land. Immigration must follow the building of such roads—the workmen employed must naturally settle along the route and the whole country become peopled in this way. I have very little faith in the predictions of my hon. friend (Mr. Seymour), for I remember that when Confederation was under discussion he drew a very gloomy picture of the Maritime Provinces—they looked to him as dismal as British Columbia does to-day. Hereferred then to Nova Scotia and especially to its revenue, but he was interrupted by the Postmaster-General, who showed that the revenue had actually doubled in one year. My hon. friend declared the lands in question to be worthless, but he is not corroborated by those who have visited the country, and are competent to express an opinion on the subject. In any case, it abounds with minerals, and fish are caught in great abundance in the waters around it. As respects the question of representation, the terms seem most equitable. When the two Canadas were united we had in the Lower Province some 50,000 more people than in the Western section, and the number of representatives was equalized. In the course of time, however, the Ontario members forgot the circumstances under which the representation was arranged, and became clamorous for an additional number for a system based on population. Now, if the colony of British Columbia should increase very rapidly they would also be calling out for representation according to population. It is better to arrange the representation on some fixed principle as in the present case and prevent dissatisfaction in the minds of the people. I predicted additional prosperity as likely to accrue from the Confederation, and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and my predictions have been more than realized though that great work is not yet completed. I have no doubt that our expectations in the present case will also be fully realized, and that we are about entering on an era of unparalleled activity and enterprise throughout the Dominion (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. REESOR—I have listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion on this important question and

must confess that I agree with a great deal that has been said on the other side. I am myself in favour of a union of British Columbia with Canada—I am also in favour of some scheme which will bring about an Inter-oceanic Railway. I believe that the time is not far distant when such a work will be accomplished. My objection to the measure before the House, however, is that it does not clearly and properly define the mode of constructing this important work. If the question was, as it has been stated by the Hon. Postmaster General, or by the hon. member from Saugeen, who spoke yesterday, (Hon. Mr. Macpherson,) I would not look upon the undertaking as insurmountable. The Hon. Postmaster General declared that Canada, under the resolutions, was not bound to construct the Railway within ten years, nor did the government intend it should be done at an unreasonable cost to the Dominion. "The intention of the Government was to offer to private companies grants of lands in alternate sections of 20 miles on either side of the proposed line of road with a cash subsidy of from seven to \$10,000 per mile, and the limit of ten years was named as indicating that every reasonable effort would be made to complete the work within that time. But the Government were not bound to that time." But the hon. member for Saugeen, (Hon. Mr. Macpherson,) gave quite another interpretation to the resolutions. He regarded railway connection between Pembina and British Columbia, as connecting the Pacific with the Railway system of Canada through the American lines as meeting all the requirements of the resolutions before the Senate. I do not understand the resolutions to be open to either of these interpretations. I understand them to bind the Dominion to accomplish this immense undertaking at whatever cost within the short period of ten years. It is upon this ground mainly that I oppose them. It is idle for members to declare that they put such and such interpretations on these resolutions—it is idle to bring up additional resolutions to say that the measure means something else than what is expressed. It is undignified to pursue such a course—it is unbefitting the Senate of the Dominion of Canada. If we mean anything different from what is expressed, we should take the proper and only course of stating so and refuse to become a party to a delusion. A large portion of the country through which the railway is expected to run has never even been explored. The only survey that has been made through that portion lying in Ontario with a view of finding a Railway route to the N

West was that made a few years ago by Mr. Herrick along the North shore of Lake Superior—It was run at an average distance of 20 miles from the shore. We find that he considers a railway on that line quite impracticable. Speculators have led many to believe that there is a practicable route which may be found from 20 to 50 miles farther north, but until we have something distinct before us in the shape of a thorough and reliable exploration survey, we should not bind ourselves in the manner proposed by the resolutions. I do hope that a practicable route will be found, and that no time will be lost in making the necessary surveys; but in the meantime I think it is improper for Parliament to declare that we will undertake a work of this magnitude before we know whether we are able to carry it out. There is no reason why so much should have been promised on the part of the Dominion. British Columbia did not ask it—they would have been satisfied, as they stated in the communications on the subject, with the expenditure of one million of dollars per annum, towards the building of a coach road and railway. The manner in which this question is put before Parliament, is very different from the course pursued in British Columbia. There it was determined before agreeing to any plan of Union with Canada, the question should be first put to the people of the Colony. The Governor says:

"While the views of Her Majesty's Government have been clearly and forcibly expressed upon this question, I am sure there is no desire to urge the Union, except in accordance with its general acceptance by British subjects in the Colony. I do not, therefore, propose that any terms agreed upon by the Government of Canada should be finally accepted, until ratified by the general verdict of the Community, so far as that can be ascertained through another Council, of which the unofficial members shall have been re-elected."

Although the population in that Colony is very small, the question is, nevertheless, submitted to them, whereas four millions of people in Canada are not consulted at all, except through the members of the Government. Parliament is not allowed to amend and improve the scheme, but must either accept it or reject it as a whole. The Government ought to have brought the question before Parliament in such a way that it would have an opportunity of improving the plan of Union, and making it more acceptable to the people of the Dominion. As respects other features of the scheme, I do not find so much fault. The people of the Colony are allowed a greater representation than other parts of Canada. They are a young

community and entitled to some consideration in this respect. Not only would I grant them a sufficient representation, but I would give them all the necessary revenue for their local requirements; but to bind the Dominion to construct the Railway within 10 years at whatever cost, is promising too much. If the resolutions plainly stated that Canada would commence to construct this railway, as soon as the state of the finances permitted, then I would cheerfully vote for them; but to be so unequivocally committed to the construction of the road within so short a period of time, is something to which I cannot agree. We must remember that so far as we know anything about the countries through which this road will pass, a great deal of it is exceedingly rocky and barren, except that portion of it which lies in Manitoba and along the Saskatchewan. In British Columbia the Cascades on the Pacific coast, the Gold, the Selkirk, and the Rocky Mountains, and in addition to these particular ranges, there are considerable portions of very rugged country, through which the road will pass. Down the Saskatchewan to Fort Garry, there is a rich agricultural country, that ought to be opened up, and through which a railway can easily be constructed. A moderate grant of land would build a railway along this fertile belt, and it ought to be constructed. From Fort Garry to Lake Superior it is possible to avail ourselves of water navigation, and a short railway is only necessary. A moderate expenditure of seven or eight millions of dollars according to Mr. Dawson's report, would accomplish all that was requisite. The very fact that we have so much water communication by the lakes, will enable us to lay freight down much cheaper at Fort Garry than it can be done by way of St. Paul. In the sessional papers of 1869, Volume 2, Mr. Dawson estimates the cost of railway and water communication between the head of Lake Superior and Fort Garry, with locks and canals where necessary, at a total sum of \$5,800,000. Basing the estimate according to McAlpine's scale, which is generally adopted, Mr. Dawson shows that the cost of carrying a ton of freight from Fort Garry to Toronto would be with such works completed only 5.35, while by railway from St. Paul by way of Chicago and Detroit to Toronto the freight is \$19.60 per ton—thus showing that the products of the North West may be brought to the seaboard at less than one-third of the cost that is required to carry freight from St. Paul. If, then, this advantage can be secured by opening up communication through our own territory at a cost of \$6,000,000, why should we incur a liability of \$100,000,000? The Government should

not have agreed to such terms of union with British Columbia. No hon. member of the Senate can desire more than I do the union of British Columbia with this Confederation; no one desires more than I do to see Canada a great and prosperous country. I will state further that I have great confidence in the future of the Dominion, but it is because I desire the successful consolidation of the Dominion that I oppose a scheme so extravagant as the one at present before the Senate and will support the amendment of the hon. member opposite.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.—I presume few of us have ever taken part in a discussion which involves interests of greater importance to the future of our country than the present one, and it has been a source of great satisfaction to myself, as I am sure it must be to every gentleman present, to find the amount of calm and thoughtful attention which has been devoted to the consideration of this question. I feel at the outset in discussing the subject that I am carried back to the period when we were called upon to consider the question whether these British American possessions should remain isolated from one another or become united into one grand nation. I felt then as I feel now that the conception of that idea was one worthy of consummation, and that every effort of the public men of this country should be used to carry it out successfully. It has been said that the idea originated in consequence of the political necessities of old Canada—that the public men of that Province were unable to carry on Government and forced to introduce the Maritime Provinces as a means of adjusting matters. But a large portion of the people of Canada looked at the question in a very different light; they considered it necessary for the purpose of developing the resources of British America, and perpetuating British power on this continent. I am glad when I look back upon the record of the past four years, to see around me some of those from other parts of the Dominion who aided materially in bringing about the consummation of this great scheme, and whatever may be said in the heat of debate or under the influence of party prejudice all must congratulate themselves on thoughtful and calm reflection upon the great success which has hitherto attended our efforts. These great results have not been unmarked by checks and disasters. At a very early stage in the confederation movement New Brunswick declared against it, influenced by the fears and predictions of the opponents of the measure who declared that ruin and decay, the loss of liberty and the deprivation of constitutional

Hon. Mr. Reesor.

rights were certain to follow a union with Canada. But so soon as the people had time for reflection they, within a short period, reversed their decision, adopted the measure and consented to unite their fortunes with the sister Provinces. and what has been the result? In place of ruin and decay which was so freely predicted we have at this moment a state of prosperity in New Brunswick unsurpassed by that of any other country, and this too in the face of the repeal of the Reciprocity measure which our American neighbours predicted would ruin us and force us into annexation. Our agricultural districts are flourishing while in our cities and villages, the increase of the various branches of manufacturing industries is very gratifying Nova Scotia too is prosperous notwithstanding the dangers which were predicted and the agitation which has been created against Canada. Since the union in 1867 the Provinces have gone on step by step consolidating and developing their resources and last year by the acquisition of the North West we extended our possessions to the base of the Rocky Mountains. When that important step was about to be taken and Parliament was asked to decide upon it, we were told by gentlemen opposite that we were bringing trouble and taxation upon the country—that we could not govern it—that it was useless to us as a possession and prophetic utterances in no measured terms were unsparingly made, and how have they been verified? The best answer is, that there are but few who will venture to express the doubts they formerly entertained of the wisdom of the accession and the country fully justified the action of Parliament in relation thereto. We are now asked to accept as a member of our Confederacy the fine Province of British Columbia, one greater in territorial extent than the extensive Province of Quebec and twice as large as the fine Province of Ontario, and which, if accepted by Parliament, as I feel assured it will be, will extend Canada from her present western limits, at the base of the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific, and yet we find some of the honorable gentlemen opposite uttering predictions in relation to this measure, which bear a strong resemblance to those to which I have referred as having been made in reference to confederation and the North West acquisition and which I trust and believe will prove as unfounded. British America will thus have become practically united from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is true that the Island of Prince Edward and Newfoundland still stand aloof, but their union with us is only a question of time and however desirable it may be to bring them in it is much less an

object to us of financial interest than one of national pride, and when that event occurs it must be only when their own interests as well as their inclinations induce them to seek for admission, and until that period arrives we should not desire their union with Canada.

It has given me much satisfaction to notice the cordiality which has prevailed during this debate notwithstanding the differences of opinion which exist on the part of gentlemen opposite and on reviewing the arguments which have been presented against the adoption of the measure, I find that they are narrowed to a few points. While some few object to the financial, and others to the constitutional arrangements, or the proposed representation which it is proposed to give the Pacific Province, the principal objection taken is against that part of the scheme which provides for the construction of a Pacific railway within a period of ten years. It is not disputed that it is desirable to admit British Columbia into our union, and the questions, which the Senate have now to consider, that principle being generally admitted, are first:—Are the terms which are contained in the resolutions equitable and just as well to British Columbia as to Canada, and, if they are, is Canada able to carry out the engagement which these resolutions will impose upon her without materially adding to the taxation of the country or increasing its burdens in such a manner as to affect its prosperity? And is it necessary that a railway should be built at all? Upon the first point I will not trouble the House, as the hon. the leader of the Government here in the opening of this debate very ably explained the terms of the arrangements which it is proposed to make with British Columbia and while he admitted their liberal character on the part of Canada demonstrated to the satisfaction of this House their fairness and the necessity which existed for the concessions which were made, and I do not understand hon. gentlemen generally to object to that part of the scheme, but I deem it to be due to the House to answer the remarks of those hon. gentlemen who object to the construction of a railway at all, and who further state that Canada is unable to carry out her engagements in reference thereto and predict ruin and discredit to our country as the result.

Now I would beg to remove an impression that seems to have taken possession of the minds of some hon. gentlemen that the proposed Railway is built in the interest of British Columbia alone, or that it is to be viewed as the price of her admission—this is not strictly the fact, and it is unfair to that Province and to this im-

portant measure so to consider it. It was clearly understood when the North Western Territory was acquired that without Railway connection between Canada and that Country, its acquisition would be a burden while with such connection, that vast and fertile region would at once become a point of attraction in the emigration from Europe to the West. Now it is estimated that the length of the proposed railway from the shores of the Pacific to connect with the Canadian system of railways will be about 2,500 miles, of which there are 1900 miles in Canada, and 600 miles in British Columbia, and it is, therefore, unfair to charge upon the latter Province that it alone is the cause of its construction throughout its entire length, as in any case we would have had to connect ourselves by railway with the North West; 'tis true this might have been a work of greater time, and its ultimate completion might have been more or less remote, but yet, as a national necessity, it had to be done, and without it that country would shortly have drifted away from us into the great Republic upon our borders, and we should, therefore, not ascribe to the Pacific Province alone the responsibility of imposing upon us the construction of the railway—the acquisition of the North West created the national necessity and the admission of British Columbia merely engages us to hasten its completion. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Wilmot) has warned the House against the measure and has read, at some length, from Sidney Smith and other authors, quotations in relation to repudiation of Pennsylvania Bonds and given us the history of the South Sea Bubble, and has endeavoured to liken to the visionary scheme last named, which had no object but money and the enrichment of a few individuals, and no promoters but the reckless speculators of that day, the great scheme of a British American Pacific Railway, whose promoters are a nation of free and enterprising people, and the objects of which are to extend the civilization and settlement and to complete the union of a continent—there is no similarity in the cases and the prophetic though melancholy predictions of that hon. gentleman will prove fallacious in this case as they were in others with which he is conversant in connection with the history of his own Province. The hon. gentleman, as one of the delegates who promoted confederation, should not forget his repeated declaration on that occasion that without a connection by railway through British territory no union between Canada and the Maritime Provinces could be maintained, and the same principle applies to British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

The hon. gentleman from the Wellington Centres (Mr. Sanborn) has stated the case fairly enough as divided into three propositions:—the propriety of the union; the mode in which that union shall be accomplished, and the financial arrangements including the railway. In no portion of his argument has the hon. gentleman taken exception to the principle of union, but has confined himself to our ability to carry out the terms. He takes exception to our undertaking to build the railway at all, and more especially to the limit of ten years to do it in. He contended that no Company can be got to build it for the land grants and money subsidy, which Government have indicated as the assistance which will probably be given. He has illustrated his position by reference to the Northern Pacific Railway, which, he stated, could be built more cheaply than ours. He has declared that the Government are taking up this scheme without information as to whether a railway is practicable or not, and he further states that a very large portion of the territory in British Columbia, through which the proposed railway will pass, is unfit for settlement, while the section of county East of Fort Garry to Nipigon lake, is of a still more objectionable character, inasmuch as in addition to its being unfit for settlement, the broken character of the country renders the construction of a railway impossible, and that even were it built, it would be impossible to work it for snow. While the Hon. Senator from Kent (Mr. Wark) adds to the list of difficulties that the country lying between the lakes and James's Bay, and thence on to near Winnipeg is not only unfit for settlement but incapable of cultivation, that even coarse grain and vegetables cannot be produced from its soil, and that no employment can be supplied by such a country to a road when built. It has been stated in another place and repeated by the Hon. Postmaster General that the Government cannot propose to build or work the road themselves, but expect to do it by means of a liberal land grant and moderate subsidy in money to a Company to accomplish that object. The expectation of the Government is that 20 miles of land on each side of the road throughout its entire length should be set aside for the construction of this work—of this reserve the company should be offered one half thereof in alternate blocks of 20 miles on each side of the railway. I will now speak of the cost of the road, and for the purpose of illustration will divide it into three sections, and of this I may say that until more accurate explanations and surveys are made any estimate which is given must be a mere

approximate one. The Government, however, have not gone into this matter without the best information that could be obtained, and they have the assurance from an Engineer of standing, which gentleman is very conversant with British Columbia and is now within hearing, and, who himself has made an exploration of a line of railway across our North West possessions at the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific through the Province, that the road is quite practicable and that even with the high price of labour which prevails in that country, that the 600 miles of it through British Columbia can be built for \$60,000 per mile, which would give the cost of that portion at \$36,000,000. That gentleman further states that 213 miles of the land through which it passes is of good quality and fit for settlement, and a considerable portion of it far above the average of settlement lands in Canada. The second division, commencing near the sources of the Saskatchewan and extending through the Red River country a distance of 1,500 miles is largely composed of prairie lands, and though an hon. gentleman has stated the cost of railways on prairie lands at \$20,000 per mile, I have placed the 15,000 miles of that section at \$30,000, or a total of \$45,000,000. Then I estimate the most eastern 400 miles, computing the whole distance at 2,500 miles, at \$60,000 per mile, or \$24,000,000, making in all a total cost of \$105,000,000.

(Mr. Mitchell here went on to show that the funds likely to be realized from the land grants and the money subsidy would be nearly sufficient to meet the foregoing estimated expenditure, and then continued:)

To the objection that no company can be got to build the road, I answer that on the Northern Pacific, which runs within a short distance of our southern boundary line where it crosses Red River, a company is building that road on land grants alone without any subsidy, through a country a great deal like our own, and where it differs from ours, that difference is in favour of Canada. I am informed that the company has already over 200 of its road built, and is progressing rapidly. If, therefore, the Northern Pacific Company can build their road on land grants, surely we have no reason to doubt that with the additional facilities which we have to offer, that we will get ours taken up. As to the ability of Canada to fulfil her engagement in reference to this road, I need scarcely say that her condition never was more prosperous than at present. Her revenue is ample for her wants, covering her public works, upon which large annual outlays are made. The

annual percentage of increase of population is beyond that of the United States, while a much greater increase must be looked for through the settlement of our new territory, so soon as facilities for transport are afforded. This increase of population alone will give a revenue which will contribute largely towards the payment of the subsidy, but it will be remembered that we have the 20 miles of land reserved in alternate blocks along the whole line of railway, from which a railway fund could be secured on the faith of such land reservation. And in addition to this, we have millions of acres of land in the North West beyond the railway reservation. I do not deem it necessary further to refer to the ordinary sources of revenue as a means of enabling Canada to meet her engagements as that has been already ably dealt with. Doubtless, the subsidy will be so arranged as to make the future provide for its fair share of the cost of this Government work, and thus avoid the danger that its construction will unduly press upon the present generation. But hon. gentlemen say, we cannot construct the work in ten years. If we can get the means to construct the line at all, we can do it in ten years, and if it is to be done then, 'twere well to do it quickly and give the present generation the benefit of its use. The Central Pacific road which was constructed through a much more difficult country, was built in three years, and I can see no reason why ours should not be built in ten. But if we assume that from any unforeseen cause, we should fail in having it completed within that time, but that we, in good faith, commenced and progressed with the work as rapidly as it was possible to do it, does any one believe that any difficulty would arise from such a course or British Columbia could find fault? I certainly do not, and while some hon. gentlemen have taken exception that it is so written in the Bond, and that the resolutions should be rejected and be again remitted back for the consideration of British Columbia. I think such a course is fraught with danger. The Parliament of that country would at once claim the right to open up and discuss each individual item of the conditions, and thus defer indefinitely the consummation of what we so much desire. The Government have, however, endeavoured to meet this objection as far as it is possible to do so on this point, without endangering the measure, by introducing a resolution explaining what they mean by the provision to construct the railway in ten years, and I have no doubt that this will be acceptable to British Columbia. It is important in considering the ability of Canada to carry out her engagement, to

look at the character of the lands through which this railway will run. I have already stated the opinion of an Engineer of standing in reference to those in British Columbia, and in confirmation thereof I will quote from a paper read before the Geographical Society of London in 1869, a description of a portion of that country through which it is proposed that the railway shall run, that for 300 miles in length it runs through "a rich plateau of cultivable soil generally heavily timbered, and capable of producing any kind of crops." In reference to this plateau it is stated that it contains millions of acres of good ground where large tracts of land are sure to be taken up as soon as the first communications are established. The writer further observes "that the Indian horses pass the winter out of doors without fodder or stabling, the best proof that the winters are not very severe," and while speaking of a portion of the country as rough, clearly indicates its fertile character and adaptability for cultivation, and grazing. With reference to that section of the country which extends from the Rocky Mountains eastward it is universally admitted to be most fertile in its character, level, fertile and with a good climate and presenting no impediments to the construction of a road, and for many hundreds of miles is of such a character that carts and waggons can be driven over it in its natural state. What a contrast to the corresponding section through which the Americans have to construct their roads to the Pacific. Dr. Henry, of the Smithsonian Institute, says: "The progress of settlement a few miles west of the Upper Missouri River, and West of the Mississippi beyond the 98th degree of longitude, is rendered impossible by the condition of climate and soil which prevail there. * * * The Rocky Mountain region and the sterile belt East of it occupies an area about equal to one third of the whole surface of the United States, and which must now remain of little value to the husbandman." Professor Hind in his report says: "The arid districts of the Upper Missouri are barren tracts, wholly uncultivable from various causes. * * * Along the 32 parallel the breadth of this desert is least, and the detached areas of fertile soil, greatest, but the aggregate number of square miles of cultivable lands amounts only to 2,300, in a distance of 12,100 miles." The State Geologist of California thus describes the Colorado desert, through which the Northern Pacific Railway runs: "Its area is some 9,000 square miles and, excepting the Colorado River which cuts across its lower end, is without river or lake. It stretches off to the horizon on all sides

without one glimpse of vegetation or life, its surface is ashy and parched; its frame of mountains rises in rugged pinnacles of black rocks, barren of soil; local storms of dust and sand are prevalent. Parts are entirely destitute even of sand, being smooth compact sun baked clay; other parts are covered with heaps of sand disposed like snow drifts in waves of 50 or 80 feet in height."

Yet this is the character of the country through which the American lines of Pacific Railway are either built, in process of building or projected. Yet we are told that with the fertile lands of the North West, with a fertile belt of the finest prairie land stretching from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains, that Canada cannot build her railway through her fertile prairies though the Americans can construct theirs over the barren desert; and, in addition to this, the passes through our territory are neither so long, so difficult of approach nor at so great elevations as are the most favourable ones of the American routes, nor are there so many ridges to cross.

Another of the objections stated by honorable gentlemen is, that the country south of Hudson's Bay and stretching west to Fort Garry is unfit for cultivation and so mountainous and rocky in its character as to be incapable of being utilized.

Now, I am at a loss to know where the authority is to be found for such a statement. I have referred to the latest works which treat upon that country and I draw entirely different conclusions as to its character. Mr. Alexander Russell, C.E., in the recent edition of his work, fresh from the press, and no higher authority can be quoted in reference to the character of that country, states that the country at a short distance to the north of Lake Superior loses its rugged character and generally declining in its height merges into silurian plateaus or fertile plains well suited for settlement; he says:—

"This declination in height and peculiar character of the range we mention, not only as meriting notice are descriptive of a large part of this section of territory, but especially because they are of importance to us and admitting of a most direct line of railway from Montreal to the Red River Settlement (and the Pacific) about 400 miles shorter than the route through Minnesota now used; as favourable as to the character of the ground, as much as what is to be made of the Intercolonial Railway in the country between St. Lawrence and New Brunswick and passing through much land as fit for settlement and with

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

as good a climate, but with less depth of snow in winter."

I would also refer, in confirmation, to the report of the surveys of that section of Provincial Land Surveyors Sinclair and Forest, fully confirmatory of the above statements.

Now, in reply to the statement of the unfitness of that country for cultivation, let me quote from the evidence of Mr. Gladman who resided 15 years at Moose Factory on the Hudson Bay, and has stated, "that the climate and soil are good, that he raised potatoes and other vegetables there in great abundance—that barley ripened well, and that horned cattle, horses, sheep and pigs were raised in abundance at this point, 230 miles north of the boundary between the territory and Canada. He adds that the soil and climate of Albany, which is 100 miles further north, does not differ much from Moose. At New Brunswick House, which is 5,100 south, he says, "the soil is very good, that excellent potatoes and every description of vegetables are raised there, oats ripened well, and wheat raised with success, and that he does not know of anything to prevent a good settlement from being made there, but it being rather distant from market."

Mr. Russell confirms these statements and speaking of the Hudson Bay Territory westward of James Bay and towards Winnipeg, says: "That the country and climate improve equally southward and westward, the western side of it even to its north west angle is wooded thickly and plenty, the Great Central Region suitable for cultivation."

Professor Hind, in his report, confirms the character given of the country as above, and states that wheat is sown 130 miles north of Fort Francis about the 20th of May, that Indian corn ripens well and that potatoes had never once, during five years cultivation, been injured by frost.

Sir John Richardson tells us that at Fort Francis, on Rainy river, where this rich tract of alluvial land commences, wheat is sown from the 1st to the 23rd of May, and abundant crops reaped at the end of August.

Mr. Russell also states and gives good and sufficient reasons therefor, that the climate is more genial "and of decidedly greater warmth" after crossing the height of land than it is on the shores of the lake, and that this wilderness extends for several hundreds of miles to the North.

Mr. Dawson, in his admirable report in speaking of the same district of county and while confirming the character above given to it, says: "That the south west-

ern part of this territory will, therefore, become the site of an important trade, while its rivers and numerous lakes offer some abundant fisheries than those of the great lakes of the St. Lawrence while the fisheries of the Hudson and James Bay are mere prolific and abundant than were our Atlantic and sea coast fisheries

In the face of such testimony, it will scarcely be repeated that the country through which we propose to build this great work is sterile and barren; on the contrary, the authorities upon the subject, and those who know it best, pronounce it to be valuable for settlement as well as rich in timber and magnificent fisheries. I may here state several gentlemen of Toronto called upon me within the week, with a view of ascertaining the value and character of these Hudson Bay fisheries, and stated that they contemplated the projection of a railway to place Hudson Bay in connection with the Toronto system of railways, and I have no doubt but ere long we will see this project carried out. The enterprise shown in the Province of Ontario warrants the belief that, with so rich and fertile a back country as the North West and Hudson Bay are, with the fertile prairies of the former and the valuable fisheries and timber which characterize the resources of the latter as well as mineral lands of the Lake Superior region, all the inducements to railway extension in the West are too great to be overlooked. I must here notice one remark of the hon. member from the Wellington Division. He says that the Act does not permit the admission of British Columbia on the terms which we propose. My reading of the 142nd section to which the hon. gentleman referred, does not to my mind bear the construction he puts on it. The fair and just interpretation is that whatever terms may be agreed upon—whether in respect to the financial arrangements or the representation in Parliament—by the Legislature of British Columbia and the Parliament of Canada, shall become law, so long as they are not at variance with the provisions of the Union Act, but are in accordance with it. The hon. gentleman also read another clause and said nothing was mentioned about representation in the Senate. I had the honor of being one of the gentlemen who framed and submitted for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, these resolutions on which the Union Act is based. The question of the representation of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island only were discussed—it was not believed that we could immediately acquire the North West—much less was it thought that we could bring in British Columbia within so short a period. I am

pleased that the results have gone ahead of our anticipations; but now that the country is brought in, I am sure that the Parliament of Canada will accept the terms of admission. I believe that this Parliament will not hastily reject them in consequence of the view entertained by some gentlemen that the resources of this country will not be able to carry out what the Government have submitted for the consideration of Parliament. But it is said that we should first carry out what we have promised—that we should first complete our canals, railways and other public works which we have undertaken. We are making fair progress with our public improvements—we are constructing the Intercolonial Railway as rapidly as possible, and we have adopted the best means in our power to obtain information with respect to the Canals of the Dominion; and I do not think that the Government is fairly open to the taunt that they have failed to fulfill their promises. Nor do I think that the great object of uniting the British possessions on this continent should be left incomplete until our canals are deepened. The hon. member also propounded the statement that the policy of the Government of England is separation from Canada; but I cannot see that there are any facts to prove this. There is nothing to authorize us to believe that the intelligent people or Parliament, or the Ministry of England desire for a moment that the most prosperous and powerful of her colonies should be separated from the Empire. The same despatch which stated the fact of the withdrawal of the troops declared explicitly that the whole force of the Empire would be ready to assist these colonies in the time of danger. At this very moment the telegraph is informing us that the Under Secretary of State has submitted to Parliament a scheme for the Union of the West India Islands, and this step is not taken to promote separation, but the contrary. So far then from Great Britain consenting to the policy of disintegration, she is thus endeavouring to build up another Confederation to perpetuate British influence. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Letellier de St. Just), in addressing the House on this subject appealed to the prejudices of his compatriots.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I did not appeal to the prejudices of any one.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I am bound to believe the hon. gentleman, but certainly I understood him to state that while granting pensions by these resolutions to gentlemen in British Columbia we were

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

turning out our own people with comparatively little remuneration, and that during the last three or four years we had dismissed officers of the public service without giving them any pension.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I have not in any way referred to the Minister of Fisheries. I referred to the time when that hon. gentleman, with others, did not find it advisable to pay pensions to those whom they were turning out of office, whilst they were giving those pensions to men in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL.—The case here is very different. The gentlemen to whom he refers were officers in connection with the old Parliament of Canada and no obligation rested on the Dominion concerning them. No obligation rested on the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to give pensions to men from whom they had never received any benefit, and in whose case they recognized no responsibility. In the case of British Columbia we know that there are only five at present entitled to pensions under these resolutions, and it is not expected that more than two of these will receive any. These men held their appointments from the Imperial Government, and it is only in keeping with Imperial policy, that in the proposed change, that Government would expect that those officers should be provided for, that their circumstances should be favourably considered. The hon. member from the Wellington division has declared that we have only consulted the interests of British Columbia. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that British Columbia presented a request to us to be admitted into the Union. We invited delegates to discuss the question, and the conference was held in due season, and certain terms arranged. It was demanded in the original proposition that there should be a waggon road constructed. Knowing the desire of the country to have a railway through the Saskatchewan territory, and believing it was only throwing away money in building a waggon road, we arranged the present terms; and notwithstanding the remarks of some hon. gentlemen I think the House will agree that we have made a reasonable calculation and provision for the work. Then consider the national advantages that must accrue from this measure. We are now the third greatest maritime power in the world. At the present time France has not as much tonnage as we have, and before ten years pass away we will have made great advances in maritime importance, for the railways and public improvements now going on or in contemplation will stimulate industry and commerce, and our ships will have more than they can do. We

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL consented.

The debate was accordingly adjourned.

The House then took up the orders of the day, and adjourned about midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th April.

After routine,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Resolved, That the railway referred to in the Address to Her Majesty concerning the Union of British Columbia with Canada, adopted by this House on Saturday, the 1st April instant, should be constructed and worked by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government; and that the public aid to be given to secure that undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy in money, or other aid, not unduly pressing on the industry and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine.

Mr. MACKENZIE said after the ruling of the Speaker yesterday in the case of the Insolvency Act, this resolution was clearly out of order.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it would be time enough to raise an objection when the motion should come before the House to-morrow.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the third reading of the Bill to amend the Act relating to duties on Customs.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) expressed his regret that the duties had been removed from salt. It could not fail to inflict serious injury on the salt interests of Western Canada. He repeated his argument in favour of continuing the Tariff, and predicted that if removed, the whole trade would revert to the Americans in two months, and the Canadian salt boilers would see their business ruined. He, therefore, moved that the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of striking out the word "salt" wherever it occurred in the measure.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the House had already expressed, by a large majority, their opposition to the Tariff, and

he thought it undesirable that these duties should be retained.

Mr. BOWELL moved in amendment to restore all farm products recently enfranchised to the dutiable list, leaving coal and coke free. He hoped some consideration would be shown for the farming interest.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the Government could not assent to a proposition to remove the duty from coal and coke and leave it on flour and wheat. He felt, however, that it would be impossible, after the opinions expressed by the House, to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Hastings.

Mr. GIBBS spoke on behalf of the salt interest, and hoped the House would not withdraw the protection which they had extended last year, and which had assisted so materially to build it up.

Mr. JACKSON said he would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Huron, believing it to be in the interests of the whole community to protect so important a manufacture.

Mr. O'CONNOR believed that the interests of the farmers should be looked after as well as those of the manufacturers. He would, therefore, support the motion of the hon. member for Hastings.

A division was then taken on Mr. Bowell's amendment which was lost, yeas 38; nays 110.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Burton, Cameron (Huron) Carling, Crawford (Brockville), Dobbie, Drew, Gaucher, Gibbs, Grant, Grover, Holmes, Hurdon, Keeler, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McCallum, McKeagney, Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Scriver, Shanly, Stephenson, Street, Thompson (Haldimand), Walsh, Webb, White, (Halton), Whitehead, and Willson.—38.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Archambeault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bèchard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron (Inverness), Campbell, Carmichael, Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Cayley, Cheval, Chipman, Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford (Leeds), Currier, Daoust, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Fournier, Gaudet, Geofrion, Gendron, Godin, Hagar, Heath, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holton, Howe, Irvine, Jackson, Jones (Halifax), Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, MacDonald, (Glengarry), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlessex), McFarlane, Magill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McConkey, McDougall

(Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McMillan, McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morison (Victoria O.), Morrison (Niagara), Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Renaud, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria N. S.), Ross (Wellington C. R.), Ryan (Montreal West), Rymal, Savary, Scat-herd, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Westmoreland), Sproat, Stirton, Sylvain, Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Wallace, Wells, Wood, Workman, Wright (Ottawa County), Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—110.

Mr. LAWSON moved an amendment that the second clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the amendment was out of Order, as it asked the House to impose duties on certain articles, several of which the House had just before decided should remain on the free list.

After some discussion on the point of order,

The SPEAKER ruled that the motion could be put.

The amendment was lost; yeas 43; nays 109.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Baker, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Burton, Cameron [Huron], Cameron [Inverness], Colby, Crawford [Brookville], Dobbie, Drew, Gaucher, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lapum, Lawson, MacDonald [Lunenburg], MacDonald [Middlesex], McCallum, McKeagney, Munroe, O'Connor, Perry, Pope, Ross (Dundas), Ross [Prince Edward], Scriver, Shanly, Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Walsh, Webb, White [Halton], White [East Hastings], Whitehead, Willson.—43.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Archambault, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Béchard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Campbell, Carling, Carmichael, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cartwright, Cayley, Cheval, Chipman, Costigan, Coupal, Daoust, Delorme, [St. Hyacinthe], Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Fournier, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Hagar, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Howe, Huntington, Irvine, Jones [Halifax], Jones [Leeds & Grenville], Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Little, MacDonald [Glengarry], MacFarlane, McKenzie, Magill, Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Renfrew], McDougall [Three Rivers], McMillan, McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morison [Victoria, O.], Morrison [Niagara], Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Renaud,

Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria N. S.], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Ryan [Montreal West], Rymal, Savary, Scat-herd, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Westmoreland), Stirton, Sylvain, Thompson [Halifax], Thompson [Ontario], Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Wallace, Wells, Wood, Workman, Wright (Ottawa County), Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—109.

Mr. OLIVER moved in amendment that the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to Committee for the purpose of striking out salt, peas, beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian Corn, and Buckwheat from the second clause.

This amendment was declared lost on a division.

Mr. CAMERON'S amendment was then put, and the vote was yeas 37; nays 114.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Bertrand, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Burton, Cameron [Huron], Carling, Colby, Crawford [Leeds], Currier, Dobbie, Drew, Gibbs, Grant, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lapum, Lawson, MacDonald [Glengarry], McCallum, Morison [Victoria, O.], O'Connor, Oliver, Pope, Shanly, Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Walsh, White [Halton], White [East Hastings], Whitehead, and Willson.—37.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Anglin, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Béchard, Bellerose, Benoit, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carmichael, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cartwright, Cayley, Cheval, Chipman, Costigan, Coupal, Daoust, Delorme, [St. Hyacinthe], Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Godin, Grover, Hagar, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Howe, Huntington, Irvine, Jones [Halifax], Jones [Leeds & Grenville], Killam, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Little, MacDonald (Antigonish), MacDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald (Middlesex), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson [Terrebonne], McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McDougall (Renfrew), McDougall [Three Rivers], McMillan, McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morison (Niagara), Munroe, Pâquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pickard, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Redford, Renaud, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Dundas], Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Ryan (Montreal West), Rymal, Savary, Scat-herd, Scriver, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Westmoreland), Stirton, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Wallace, Webb, Wells, Wood, Workman, Wright (Ottawa County), Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.) and Young.—114.

Mr. O'Connor.

The motion for the the third reading of the Bill was then declared carried.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS presented the report of the Committee on Banking and commerce and

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER that of the Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraphs.

ESTIMATES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved that the House should go into Committee of Supply.

INTERFERENCE WITH ELECTIONS BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that before the House went into Committee of Supply there were one or two matters to which he desired to draw attention. Complaints had already been made of the interference of the Dominion Government in the local elections in Ontario, and he had now received a letter from the county of Essex in which he was informed that Mr. Gilbert McMicken went to that county and stated that he was there as the authorized agent of Sir George E. Cartier, and that he [Sir George] desired Mr. Prince rejected and the opposing candidate returned. He had this information on the most reliable authority, and asked that enquiry should be made, as there could be nothing more improper than to allow Government officials to interfere in the local elections. Another case had also been brought to his notice in connection with the Census. A gentleman appointed as Census Commissioner for the county of Lambton was applied to by the Assessor of one of the townships in that county for an appointment as enumerator, the applicant stating that he could discharge the duties of the two offices in conjunction. He was however informed that the census appointments were purely political; and unless he could state that he had supported the Government at the last election, or would promise to do so at the next he could not be appointed. He could make neither the statement nor the promise, and did not receive the position. He condemned these attempts to influence the late elections in Ontario as none the less criminal because unsuccessful.

Mr. JONES [Halifax] here commenced to speak, but the Speaker said he desired it to be understood that though of course any member was at liberty to state any grievance, the subject of that grievance could not be debated unless a distinct motion was laid before the House,

Mr. JONES then said that he had on a

previous occasion directed attention to the interference of the Government in the Nova Scotia local elections, and he had since received a most extraordinary corroboration of the statements he had made. He had received a letter from a young gentleman of the name of Peter Macnab, son of the Hon. James Macnab, a member of the Legislative Council, of Nova Scotia. It was well known that on account of the interference of the Heads of Departments in the Dominion Government in forcing their servants to vote against their wishes, the Nova Scotia Government desired to pass a measure to disfranchise all servants of the Dominion Government. When the measure came before the Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr. Macnab chanced to be very ill, and it was therefore hoped that his absence might be secured, and so help to defeat the Bill. In order to accomplish this, a gentleman named Dr. Wickwire, formerly a partner of the Hon. President of the Council, approached the son, Mr. Peter Macnab, with an offer that if he would persuade his father to remain at home he should receive a situation under the Dominion Government, worth \$700 a year. The young gentleman thought this a most outrageous and insulting offer, but he was advised to carry on the negotiations, in order to ascertain from whom the offer emanated. The result would be seen from the documents he had received, and which he would read to the House. First, telegram from Dr. Tupper to Dr. Wickwire, dated at Ottawa, 31st March 1871. "Your telegram received.—Anything Hill engages to do, I will carry out." Second, letter from M. B. Daley to Mr. Peter Macnab, dated Halifax 31st March, 1871.—"I will guarantee you a situation under the Dominion Government in Halifax, worth at least \$700 per annum, if you will carry out the arrangements which you and Dr. Wickwire have made." Third,—letter from D. McNeil Parker to Mr. Peter Macnab, dated 1st April, 1871. "Telegram from Dr. Tupper to Dr. Wickwire has just been received, in which Dr. Tupper states he will carry out any arrangements made by Mr. Hill with you. Mr. Hill is just now absent from the city, but the matter will be arranged by Mr. Daley, and I hereby undertake that Mr. Hill will ratify any arrangements made with you by Mr. Daley, on his return." He thought this was quite sufficient to substantiate the general charges he had made against the Government on a previous occasion, and he would ask whether a member of the Dominion Government should be allowed so to prostitute the patronage of the country as to attempt to coerce a local Legislature. To his mind, the transaction was so disre-

putable as only to require to be laid before the House to receive the condemnation it deserved. The local Government of Nova Scotia was at all events carrying out the views for which it was elected, and should be exposed to no interference at the hands of the Dominion Government. He might state also that the President of the Council had endeavored to invoke religious discord into the public affairs of the Province, and he trusted this and the other action of that hon. gentleman would not fail to receive the condemnation it so well deserved.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER was glad that he was thus afforded an opportunity of explaining this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that as no motion was before the House, there could be no discussion.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER charged the member for Lambton with attempting to prevent him from refuting the accusations brought against him.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken, he had no desire to prevent him from speaking, but merely to make the discussion regular.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that no one could doubt that when such serious charges were made against a member of the Government, it was quite competent for him to give the answer on the instant, and he was sure there was not a member in the House who would not desire that he should be allowed to reply to the imputations thrown upon him. He would state the facts of the case as briefly as he could, and would leave it to the judgment of the House and the country whether any blame attached to him in the matter. He had already stated that when it became necessary to appoint enumerators for the taking of the Census in the county of Halifax, Mr. Power, one of the representatives for that county, was invited to make recommendations, but that calling in the assistance of the other member for Halifax, he abused the confidence of the Government by presenting a list composed almost entirely of the bitterest opponents of the Government. Since that time, his hon. colleague, the Secretary of State for the Provinces, and he, determined in cases of future appointments to ask the recommendation of Mr. Hill, the member representing the same constituency in the local legislature, and ever since all applicants for appointments there, had been referred to that gentleman. A Bill was under the consideration of the House brought in by the Local Government of Nova Scotia for the purpose of disfranchising all office holders and employees under the Dominion Government throughout Nova Scotia.

Mr. Jones.

That Bill was introduced by the Attorney General who stated that he hoped to pass a Bill that would prevent any one who had a "smell" of Canada from voting. When it was introduced into the Upper House, Mr. Stairs who had been appointed by the present Government, and was a gentleman of the very highest standing in Nova Scotia, threw up his seat in the Legislative Council rather than support a measure so monstrous. It then became a matter of importance to the friends of this Government that this measure should be defeated, and he would ask whether it was not only important to the Government but to the whole Dominion, that there should be in Nova Scotia a Government which had not emblazoned on its flag the destruction of the Union, which was certainly the object of the present Government. Well, then, who was this Mr. Macnab whose vote it seems was to be secured. Why, he was a gentleman who had ever sat side by side with him (Dr. Tupper) in the Government of Nova Scotia, and in approaching him he approached an old political friend. At this time, however, Mr. Macnab had become utterly broken down by age and illness, so as to be both in body and mind utterly incapacitated for the discharge of his duties. In former times Mr. Macnab urged him (Dr. Tupper) to recommend his son for an appointment, which had not then been done. When it was ascertained that the Local Government was endeavouring to obtain Mr. Macnab's vote by promising to provide a situation for his son, and under these circumstances he was asked whether if Mr. Macnab went right, he would guarantee that his son should receive an office. The gentlemen who had been named in the matter were all of the highest character and standing, and all were ready to prove that no person approached Mr. Peter Macnab with an offer, but that, on the contrary, that young man went to Dr. Wickwire with a statement that if an office were given to him, his father would be prepared to vote right, but if not, the Local Government would give him an appointment if his father would act with them: These were the circumstances under which the application was made to him, and he dealt with it in the same way as all other applications from that district, he referred the matter to Mr. Hill, telegraphing, "Anything Hill undertakes to do, I will carry out."

Mr. BLAKE asked for the message to which that was an answer.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER read it as follows: "Hon. James Macnab votes to-day on disfranchising Bill. Can you guarantee Peter office if father is put right?" This mes-

sage showed him that unless something were done, the son would go and say, "You see Dr. Tupper refuses to give me any consideration, you had better go for the Bill." He had not, however, guaranteed any office nor named any sum, but simply referred to Mr. Hill, the representative of the County, who was consulted on every such case. Under these circumstances considering that Mr. Macnab had been his constant supporter for many years, and had many claims for consideration at his hands, he was not prepared to give an answer to the request which would secure an additional vote in support of a measure which he believed to be utterly hostile to the interests of the Dominion, and most injurious in its consequences, and he was confident that his explanation would be considered perfectly satisfactory. The hon. member for Halifax had stated that he (Dr. Tupper) had endeavoured to evoke religious strife. At the time he entered public life, there was the greatest hostility between the Protestant and Roman Catholic bodies, but the course had since changed, and he had always had the hearty co-operation of His Grace the Roman Catholic Arch-Bishop and of that body except on the Union question, and had in fact very recently received a letter from His Grace stating that the good feeling which had ever existed between them remained unbroken.

Mr. JONES [Halifax] said that Mr. Macnab had, subsequently to his being a member of the Government, of which the Hon. President of the Council was at the head, become an earnest supporter of the anti-union body, and therefore could not be the firm friend represented. At the time the message was sent to Mr. Hill, he had ceased to be a member of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, having forfeited his seat. The Hon. President of the Council had failed to say whether the steps he had taken were authorized by his colleagues.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that his colleagues now learned the matter for the first time, he having taken the whole responsibility.

Mr. BLAKE then rose to speak, and after some discussion as to whether he was in order in continuing the debate, the Speaker allowed him to proceed. He then spoke in the strongest terms in condemnation of the course taken by the Hon. President of the Council, and said that in his opinion, the very admissions he had made, rendered it unfit that that hon. gentleman should remain a Minister of the Crown for a moment longer. The hon. gentleman had stated that his colleagues were entirely ignorant of the matter, but he warned them that they must either en-

dorse or condemn the conduct of the President of the Council, and that they could only escape the disgrace which attached to that conduct by taking the necessary action to separate themselves from him. There could be no mistake in the matter, the hon. gentleman had himself acknowledged the course he had taken, and the only justification he could urge was that the Local Government were bidding for the vote, he therefore thought it fit to go into the market and outbid them, and he asked the House whether they would endorse the proposition that a Minister of the Dominion was justified in using the patronage of the country for the purpose of buying votes in the Legislatures of the Provinces, he thought it was quite apparent that the hon. gentleman had, by his own confession, proclaimed his utter unworthiness for the high position he occupied.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said he had always abstained from introducing the local matters of Nova Scotia into that House, as whatever differences they might have in that Province, he thought it better they should be settled there. He regretted that he had been absent when the hon. member for Halifax had chosen to take some liberties with his name, and he should take a fitting opportunity of replying to the aspersions cast upon him, but he did not desire to mix his own affairs with the matter now before the House. He desired to mention, however, that on the occasion of the late election at Halifax, the hon. member had defamed his character and aspersed his policy behind his back, and had repeated the same thing in different parts of the country, and he thought that proceeding cowardly and base in the extreme. He (Mr. Howe) although, asked to interfere in the election there, had refused to do so, and had not addressed a single word to the county on the subject, and as to the utterances of the member for Halifax, he knew he would one day have him face to face. He remembered that that hon. gentleman had once followed him into the county of Hants, and had greatly alarmed the electors, by the statement, that if he (Mr. Howe) were elected, he [Mr. Jones] would never take his seat. He remembered also that he had then done his best to re-assure the electors that even were that threat to be carried into execution, the crops might still grow, and the flowers bloom. The hon. gentleman had, however, taken his seat, and here he was at his dirty work again. He reminded him of the nursery rhyme about

Little Bo-peep, who lost his sheep

And did not know where to find them;

But he left them alone till he came home, Wagging his tail behind him.

Jones, like Bo-peep, had come home at last, but there was not much wag in his tail, nor was it very long. He might say that he had invariably consulted the representatives of the Counties in matters of patronage, and in nineteen cases out of twenty, their recommendations had been accepted. In the case of the Census Enumerators, when in Nova Scotia last summer he fell in with Mr. Power, and asked him to send up a list of suitable judicious persons to act as enumerators for the County of Halifax. He had no doubt that had Mr. Power depended on himself alone, the list would have been a good one, but, unfortunately, he consulted his colleague (Mr. Jones), who was incapable of dealing with the Government in a fair and honourable spirit, and the list was found such that it could not possibly be acted on.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. HOWE resumed. He said the list of enumerators sent up from Halifax included hardly a Dominion supporter, and this was through the influence of the hon. member for Halifax. With respect to these telegrams which had been read in the House he knew nothing. He could say, however, that he regretted to hear that his esteemed old friend, Mr. McNab had grown so feeble in mind and body. A more manly, generous, honourable, noble-minded man never lived, and he (Mr. Howe) believed the hon. gentleman was incapable of a dishonourable act. He (Mr. Howe) would like to hear all the particulars of the transaction, and if it should be found that the young man had failed to protect his father's honor, he deserved that the curse of heaven should follow him. He (Mr. Howe) could express no opinion on the subject until he could hear all the particulars on both sides, but he feared that the young man had been playing fast and loose, and betraying his imbecile father's honor. The Hon. President of the Council had stated truly in saying that he had taken this step entirely on his own responsibility.

Mr. MACKENZIE said this was a matter of too great importance to be allowed to pass without recording the opinion of the House respecting it, on the journals. It had been frequently asserted that there was a close connection between this Government and the Governments of the local legislatures; but this was the first instance in which the administration of the day had interfered in a direct and flagrant manner with the action of the Local Legis-

latures. It was desirable that there should be no connection whatever between the Central and the Local Governments, and he felt it his duty to bring this principle before the House and have a decision respecting it. We had in this country large Companies, such as the Grand Trunk Railway Company grossly interfering in the elections, and bringing an undue pressure to bear to elect supporters of the Government. It was high time that this undue interference on the part of this Government should be checked. He, therefore, moved that all the words in the motion after "that" be expunged and the following substituted: "It appears from the statement made to this House by the Hon. Chas. Tupper, C. B., President of the Council, that on the 31st day of March, last, a Bill was depending in the Legislative Council of the Province of Nova Scotia for disfranchising officials in the employment of the Government from voting at Nova Scotia elections, and that the vote of the Hon. Jas. Macnab, a member of the said Council, was material to the decision of the Bill, and that the said Hon. Chas. Tupper who was desirous that the said Bill should be defeated, this day received a telegram as follows:— "Hon. James Macnab votes to-day for disfranchising Bill. Can you guarantee Peter an office if his father is put right. Signed, WICKWIRE." To which the following reply returned: "Your telegram received. Anything Hill engages to do, I will carry out. Signed, CHAS. TUPPER." That the Government in pursuance of the said telegrams, in order to secure the vote of the said Hon. James Macnab, an office in the Dominion service was offered to said Peter Macnab, son of the said James Macnab. That, in the opinion of this House, the conduct of the said Hon. Chas. Tupper in proposing to so exercise the patronage of the Dominion Government as to influence the action of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, was a flagrant violation of law and public morality and calculated if unrebuked by Parliament to reflect deep disgrace on the country and its institutions.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said though late in the session he hoped the House would indulge him for a few minutes while he defended himself. Five years ago to-day he was fighting the battle of Confederation under the banner of George Brown, Macdonald and Cartier. Five years ago to-day he was on the floor of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, striving to carry out the great policy of endeavouring to unite the Provinces for the public good. When his opponents were baffled and defeated by every fair and honourable means, the

Hon. Mr. Howe.

leader of the present Government in Nova Scotia, who was then in opposition, rose in his place and appealed to Parliament to defeat this measure because, he affirmed on his honour as a man, that George Brown had approached him and endeavoured to bribe him to support Confederation (hear, hear). Five years ago, he (Dr. Tupper) was not only fighting the battle of Confederation, but he was also defending the character of the very man whose colleagues were now endeavouring to blacken and destroy his (Dr. Tupper's) character. He stood in this House making no suppliant appeal to the followers of the Government to support him. He absolved the Government and he absolved their supporters from any claim. He was unwilling to put the question on such narrow ground as that. It had never been his position as a man or as a member of an Administration. For sixteen years he had served his native Province as a public man, and he left the Legislature of his Province without a single stain on his character, without a single political crime against him, except that of fighting the battle of Confederation. Every one knew that party spirit had gone to as high a pitch in Nova Scotia as anywhere. After he had carried the question of Confederation and resigned his position as leader of the Government and thrown himself into the hands of the people, he stood there in the presence of his countrymen without an act that could touch his character as a man or his political honour. He stood in the same position here to-night. The motion of the hon. member for Lambton might be carried, but it would not touch the Government. It would touch him and him alone. It would place him on a seat as an independent member untrammelled by any consideration in serving in the best manner the best interests of the Union. Let every hon. member in this House deliver his condemnation if he thought it a duty he owed to this Parliament and his own conscience. He (Dr. Tupper) as an independent member of this House would be able to give the Government his support as well in such a position as under any other circumstances. Now, what were the particulars of the case. Happily a letter from Hon. James Macdonald appeared in the *Toronto Telegraph* received by this night's mail. He would just read this communication from a man who enjoyed the confidence of the country and whose word was taken wherever he was known:—

"On Saturday morning last Dr. Wickwire came into my office and told me that Peter McNab, the son of the Hon. James McNab, had informed him that his father was not disposed to vote for the bill to disfranchise the

employees in the Dominion offices, but that Mr. Annand was pressing him and promised to provide an office worth \$600 a year for him, if his father would vote with the Government, or resign. That he (Peter McNab) had, some time before, applied to Dr. Tupper for an office under the Dominion Government, but had not succeeded in his application; that his father was infirm and would probably not be able to attend in his place, but if he could do so, he wished to vote against the Government bill, and if he (Dr. Wickwire) would use his influence with Dr. Tupper to get him an office under the Dominion, it would enable his father to vote on the measure then pending in the Legislative Council, according to his wishes, and at the same time secure the interests of his son. I asked Dr. Wickwire if he had seen the Hon. James McNab. He said not. I then told him I feared Peter McNab might be attempting to deceive and mislead him, with the view of playing into the hands of the Government, and putting Mr. Hill and his friends into a false position at the approaching election. I had not spoken to Mr. McNab or his son for months; the latter I barely knew on the street; but from what I had heard of his past character and conduct, he is certainly the last man to whom I would knowingly give the opportunity of truthfully charging me with such an intrigue as he now seeks to fasten upon me. Dr. Wickwire showed me Dr. Tupper's telegram as published, and hearing from the statements of Dr. Wickwire that the negotiations between himself and Mr. Peter McNab were perfectly legitimate and proper, I had no hesitation in undertaking for Mr. Hill that he would use his influence to supplement any proper and legitimate arrangement made by Dr. Wickwire. I deny that I or any other of the gentlemen who signed the letters published, contemplated any corrupt or improper approach to the Hon. J. McNab. The dishonor is with the man who by his own admission, led his friends who were labouring for his interests only, to believe in his truth and honour, while he was deliberately betraying them. I may be allowed to say that after Mr. Stairs' announcement on Friday in the Legislative Council, I looked upon the opposition to the Bill as hopeless, as I supposed the Government would immediately fill his place, and thus secure a commanding majority. The endeavor to enable Mr. McNab to vote according to his wishes, was, I think, perfectly legitimate, and I do not believe that a Government who are driven to the necessity of striking down the privileges of hundreds of honorable and upright men, to enable them as they hope to carry this county are the people to attack by means of such tools as Mr. Peter McNab the character and standing of such men as Dr. Parker, Mr. Hill, Mr. Daly, or Dr. Wickwire."

This was the statement of the case made by Mr. Macdonald. The anti-unionists had already driven the Hon. Mr. Stairs to resign his office before this circumstance had ever occurred, because he felt that while he owed his position to Mr. Annand, he could never vote for a measure so obnoxious to the country. The attempt was made by Mr. Annand to purchase the vote of Mr. Macnab, a gentleman who for seven years sat side by side with him (Mr. Tupper) in the Government of which he

was then head. He was not only under a deep obligation to Mr. Macnab, personally, but was pledged to this very Peter Macnab to find him an office as soon as possible. This proposition came to him (Dr. Tupper) at a time when the Local Government were endeavoring to purchase the vote of Mr. Macnab when he had lost mental and physical vigour, and when there was a most important crisis to this country impending, an attempt was made to purchase Mr. Macnab's vote in this emergency, by offering him an office worth \$600 per year, fearing that Mr. Macnab would be brought to vote contrary to his own wishes, he (Dr. Tupper) was told that he might prevent it by finding the young man an office. His (Dr. Tupper's) answer was, that Mr. Hill, the gentleman recently elected to represent the county of Halifax in the Local Legislature, was the party to be consulted and instead of saying I will give you an office if your father votes against the measure, he telegraphed, "Whatever arrangements Mr. Hill makes, I will carry out." There was the case on which he would go to the House and to the country, such was his offence for which he was brought before the House, under circumstances which should cause the gentleman making this motion, to blush. Who were his (Dr. Tupper's) accusers? Who was it that dared to stand up and assail him because he consented, when Mr. Hill recommended a gentleman to an office, or promised him a place, that he (Dr. Tupper) would meet his wishes and provide an office for the son of his old colleague? The hon. member for Lambton was his accuser, and before he (Dr. Tupper) sat down he would show that the hon. member had reduced bribery to a science (cheers). He would show that the hon. gentleman should be the last to dare to lay a finger on the character of a public man. Mr. Annand was the man who, on the floor of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, had affirmed on his honour, that George Brown had endeavoured to bribe him, and yet the hon. member for Lambton became his henchman (cheers and laughter). Mr. Wilkin's speeches had been quoted in the House and had excited disgust in the mind of every honourable man who had heard them, and yet these were the men who had united with the hon. member for Lambton for the most corrupt purposes that had ever disgraced public men. The hon. member for Lambton was an humble follower of George Brown who had taken advantage of the cry that Ontario's money had been sacrificed to satisfy Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman was one of those who had opposed the just claims of Nova Scotia, and yet was ready to seize on

the support of any one from that Province, no matter how opposed he might be to Confederation. The hon. member for Lambton had gone to the lower Provinces and united with those men who not only assailed this Government, but had also villified the Opposition of this House in equally abusive terms. He was one of those who, though he had staked his honor as a public man that the public treasury of this Dominion had been robbed for Nova Scotia, yet, in secret, had bargained with anti-unionists and annexationists promising for their own support to give \$66,000 more of the public money to Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Lambton had in a former debate denied that he had, during his recent speeches, said a disparaging word of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman, in a speech delivered at a political banquet in Toronto, on the 16th of December, was reported by the *Globe* to have said there—after having made a compact with the anti-unionists and annexationists—the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to stand up and say: "The Government said, we will pay \$2,000,000 more to these people, and they had an idea that this would give ample satisfaction to the Province, while, in fact, it was received as a bone thrown to a dog to stop his growling" (cheers). This was the manner in which the hon. member had insulted the people of Nova Scotia. That was the way the hon. gentleman had acted, instead of standing up honestly, and saying: "Gentlemen, I am bound as a public man to confess that the statement that I made in Parliament that the Administration of the day had not only robbed the country, was not true, but they have refused to give Nova Scotia what she should have, and I will ask Parliament to give her \$66,000 more." That would have been honest, but instead of that, the hon. member went back to Ontario with the same cry that carried it before—that cry of sectionalism. Having secured his election on that cry and secured support for his friends, he had the hardihood to come back here and demand that \$66,000 more should be added to the bone already thrown to this dog to stop him from growling (cheers).

A MEMBER—What dog does he mean?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—Nova Scotia is the dog, as the member for Lambton says, to whom the bone was thrown. If any hon. members should blush for shame at the mention of bribery it should be the hon. member for Lambton; for a more damning record could not be brought against any member of this Parliament (cheers). The hon. member for Durham, too, had attacked him (Dr. Tupper) but the life of that hon. gentleman had been spent in de-

Hon. Dr. Tupper.

fending either side of the question—assaulting the innocent or defending the guilty—whichever gave the highest bribe (cheers and laughter). He (Dr. Tupper) expected nothing else, but upon the most flimsy and paltry pretence that the honourable member would rise with affected indignation to talk about public morality, (laughter). He would like to hear what the hon. member would have to say if such a charge were brought against any gentleman on his own side of the House. He could imagine the withering terms of indignation against the accuser to which the House would be treated if such a charge were brought against a member supporting the honorable member for Durham. But after the action of the honorable Gentleman in the Local Legislature with respect to the Nova Scotia Act and afterwards coming to this House and joining with the honorable member for Lambton in demanding more money for Nova Scotia—he (Dr. Tupper) could understand his speaking for any side. The honorable member for Shefford had spoken with much solemnity on public morality in the House to-night, but the hon. members opposite were guilty of bribery and corruption of the blackest dye, and yet come here and lecture the House on the virtue of political propriety. If there were any gentlemen in this House who should blush when bribery is mentioned, and hide their heads whenever political corruption was spoken of, it was the members for Shefford, for Chateauguy and Hochelaga. They were the men, who, when the interests of their party were at stake, were not only ready to use \$66,000 to buy up support in a Province where they had none, but they were the men who, when power and place were at stake, did not hesitate to elevate to the highest judicial position, not their friend and colleague, but one of their strongest opponents, and this judgeship was given in order to retain their places in the Government (cheers). If he had such a record in his past history, he would not be able to stand up in this House to-night, and challenge an independent verdict, and yet, these gentlemen came here having done that which the hon. member for Shefford admitted, had convulsed this country with indignation and disgust.

Hon. Mr. HUNTINGTON begged leave to correct his hon. friend. His statement was that it had convulsed the Tory party, not the people of the country (hear, hear).

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he was not at all surprised that the hon. member began to feel his position (laughter). Orator and essayist as the hon. member was, if he believed that his paltry clap-trap would

wipe out the record of his former career, he was mistaken (hear, hear). He (Dr. Tupper) would not detain the House longer. When the whole transaction should be placed before the people of this country this miserable, futile attempt to endeavor to strike a blow at the Government would excite the commiseration and contempt of even the followers of his accusers in this House and throughout the country (cheers). He could understand that the hon. gentlemen opposite, hungering for position and place, were ready to lend themselves one day to one principle, and the next day to trample the very principles they had propounded, beneath their feet to purchase support. He could understand that they would stick at nothing, and were ready to stoop to anything in order to accomplish their purposes, but, if they thought they could injure him they were mistaken. Having spent the prime of his life in steady, unqualified exertion to build up the interests of his country, he placed himself unreservedly, not in the hands of the hon. members who supported the Government, but unreservedly in the hands of hon. members on the other side of the House. He was in this Government to-day, not because he wished to belong to it for the sake of office, but under the conviction that his presence gave them increased strength in carrying out the great work in which they were engaged (cheers.) He should much prefer to be an independent member of this House, and if it were the unbiased judgment of hon. members sitting on both sides of the House that he had been guilty of anything which rendered it improper that he should remain any longer a Minister of the Crown, he would retire to an independent bench. He was alone responsible for his own act, and if it were necessary he would retire into private life, with the proud conviction that, regardless of party, he had thrown his best energies into the work of Confederation, and striven in whatever position he had been placed in such a manner as was best calculated to carry out the union of the Provinces, and he should retire into private life with the satisfaction of knowing that his efforts, humble though they had been, had assisted in placing this country in a position higher than it would ever have occupied without Confederation. He left the matter to the House, willing to bow to their decision, whatever that might be (prolonged cheers.)

Hon. Mr. DORION spoke strongly in disapprobation of the action of the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. MACKENZIE replied at some length to the remarks which Hon. Dr. Tupper

had made. His desire in moving his amendment was to absolve the House from all responsibility in Dr. Tupper's conduct and to affix the merited stigma upon the guilty party.

Mr. McKEAGNEY then rose and addressed the House in an eloquent and effective speech, justifying Dr. Tupper.

After a few words from Mr. Blake the House divided, when Mr. Mackenzie's amendment was lost by the following large majority—Yeas, 51; Nays, 93. Majority for the Government 42.

The House then went into Committee of Supply—Mr. Street in the chair—and passed a number of items adjourning at 1:15 a.m.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 5th, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

The debate on the British Columbia Resolutions was then resumed.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER—My views on the question have been so fully explained by my hon. friend from the Wellington Division and other gentlemen who have followed on the same side that I feel it is idle for me to occupy the time of the House at any great length. I merely rise for the purpose of offering a word of explanation with respect to the vote I intend to give to-day. Some of the speeches delivered in the early part of this discussion seemed to partake largely of the spread-eagle style indulged in so frequently by our friends across the borders. Some hon. gentlemen, too, would have us infer that those who voted against the resolutions were not only opposed to the admission of British Columbia on reasonable terms, but to the Confederation generally—a statement which is, in my opinion, exceedingly unfair. (Hear, hear.) I voted in favor of the measure whilst a member of the whole Legislative Council of Canada, and supported it through all its stages, and I have been ready to support any measure that has for its object the consolidation of the Union and is likely to render it a success. I am sincerely desirous of doing everything in my power to draw the different Provinces more closely together—to dispel sectional jealousies and

prejudices, and secure the largest amount of material prosperity that it is possible to obtain under the circumstances. I am quite willing to admit that the political aspect of this question should not be overlooked by gentlemen who take an interest in the progress of the Dominion. It would be unwise to delay the settlement of the question for any great length of time. As respects the representation proposed to be given to British Columbia, it is greatly in excess of that accorded to the other Provinces under the Union Act; but that is a matter which time will remedy. With reference to the financial arrangements, I may say, that if not extravagant, they are much more liberal than those given to the other Provinces, and necessarily unfair to the Dominion; but at the same time I would feel it my duty to support the resolutions, were it not for the clauses providing for the construction of a railway, the cost of which I hold to be far beyond the resources of this country, (hear, hear). It is all very well to talk of its not being the intention of the Government to act upon these resolutions—that they do not contemplate spending a large amount of money. I give them credit for all sincerity, but we know their views may alter; and we have not so much to do with present intentions as with what the resolutions provide. I hold that when these resolutions are adopted they will have the force of law and that there is every probability of this road being constructed without reference to what the expense may be. The road, we may be sure, cannot be constructed except at an expense that must necessarily entail very serious burthens upon the country. The important question suggests itself, how is this road to be kept up? Reference to some of our leading roads in Canada may afford us some valuable information on this point. I refer, for instance, to a railway which may be considered probably one of the most prosperous and best managed in Canada—I mean the Great Western, running through a territory which is really the garden of Ontario. The traffic on the line is very large, and then, as most of you are aware, it connects with the Eastern and Western systems of railways from which it derives a large part of its business—no less than 60 per cent. Notwithstanding all these favourable circumstances, which have assisted it ever since its construction the shareholders have not received more than from 2 to 2½ per cent on their outlay. The Grand Trunk Railroad may be regarded as still more favourably situated in some respects—connecting as it does with the shipping of the world at Quebec and Portland—commanding the immense trade of Montreal, King-

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

ston, Toronto, and of almost every leading city and town in Quebec and Ontario—and connected with the great system of American railways, East and West. At the same time I believe that I am correct in saying that up to the present date shareholders have never got any dividend at all. Under these circumstances how is it possible for this railway, even if you can construct it, to pay its running expenses. No railway can be started under more auspicious circumstances than the Central Pacific Railroad. It is now in full operation; it has the trade of 40,000,000 of people; it receives a large amount for the transportation of stores from the Government. Its income from these sources is immense, and yet it is well known in railway circles that the road does not pay. In view of all these considerations, and our experience of railways in this country, I am satisfied that if this line is constructed, and the country burdened for all time to come with an enormous debt, that will not even be the end of our trouble; for it will be an ever increasing source of expense to the Dominion. It is well known that a large quantity of the land through which this road is intended to run is not worth 20 cents an acre. It is, therefore, folly to say that we are likely to make lands of such a character available for the construction of the work. But I feel that I ought not to weary the House any further with my reasons for voting against resolutions committing the country to such a dangerous policy. I shall therefore content myself with saying that desirous as I am of supporting the measures of the Government in connection with Confederation and making the Union a success, yet I cannot give my assent to these resolutions, but am bound to vote for the amendment, as decidedly most advantageous to the public interests. (Hear.)

Hon. Mr. MACFARLANE—My hon. friend who has just sat down, is, doubtless a high authority with respect to the paying qualities of railways on this Continent—if I were interested in railway matters, to no one would I more readily apply for information. He seems, however, to look at this question from a very narrow point of view. He only considers the amount of dividend returned to the stockholders, and does not take into the account the advantages which these works confer on a country. We now know that there are a number of railways which have been really constructed by the Dominion, and do not pay—for instance the roads in Nova Scotia; but, nevertheless, they are developing our resources and promoting the material prosperity of the country to a very great extent. The Grand Trunk Railway may have been a very expensive work to con-

struct, but I would like to see any man in the western part of the Dominion who would willingly see the road stop its operations to-morrow. I do not intend to enter into any elaborate argument, with respect to the political or financial aspect of this question; for gentlemen generally agree that British Columbia ought to be admitted into the Union, and that it is entitled to a certain share of the representation in this Parliament, and very little exception is taken to an arrangement which gives the people of the Colony sufficient money to meet their local requirements. I confess, however, that I looked with some distrust at first on the clause in reference to the railway—it seemed to me that it might impose a heavy burthen on the country. But when I heard the explanations of the Hon. Postmaster General, as to the manner in which this road is to be built—when my hon friend near me, (Mr. Macpherson,) showed there was a cheap mode of effecting the necessary communication with the Pacific shore, my apprehensions vanished. It is urged, on the other hand, that the Government are pledged to build this line themselves; but I am of opinion that, under these resolutions, we only bind ourselves to obtain the construction of the road by a grant of public land and a small money subsidy to some private company; and all this I am sure can be done without burthening our resources heavily. British Columbia herself will soon form a part of the Union, and be equally interested with ourselves in promoting the prosperity of the Dominion, and keeping the expenses within moderate limits; and it is therefore idle to say that she is trying to lead this country into a reckless expenditure. No one can doubt, that since the establishment of Union a great stimulus has been given to the development of our resources—that commerce has increased—that there is abundant money to carry on the ordinary transactions of trade. I feel naturally some interest in this matter, for I have been among those who took a part in the initiation of the scheme of Union. As respects Nova Scotia, I have no hesitation in saying that she exhibits an amount of prosperity she never exhibited before, and is in a better condition to develop her resources than at any previous time in her history. I believe that the proposed plan of Union with British Columbia will still further strengthen the Confederation. Under these circumstances, I am prepared to give my support to the resolutions introduced by the Government.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE—in common with other gentlemen, I have supported Confederation from the beginning—while, a member of the Legislative Council of Canada

I supported that scheme, and I just as firmly believe, as any friend of the present plan, that it is necessary to the success of the Union, that British Columbia should be admitted into the Confederation. But although still a friend of Confederation, and the admission of British Columbia as a member of the Union, I do not conceive that I pledged myself to support any scheme which might be introduced by this or any other administration. I cannot support this scheme because I believe the terms embodied in these resolutions will be found to be very onerous to the people of this Dominion—it is a scheme which in itself cannot be productive of the advantage claimed for it to the people of British Columbia, and it must certainly be most injurious to the inhabitants of this Dominion. The Postmaster General in introducing this measure, did it in a very pleasing and able manner. I think he made the most of a bad case in placing the matter as he did before the Senate. His speech is able, from his own point of view. He divided the subject into three propositions. First, Representation; secondly, the Financial arrangements; and thirdly, the Railway. He told us that “were we to deal with British Columbia, or had we dealt with Manitoba on the principle of representation by population, they would be left without representation at all.” I believe that the Government have dealt with this territorial question, not as they ought to have dealt with it. Manitoba, with her present population, ought not, in my opinion, to have been admitted to representation in Parliament, and if that were the proper rule in the case of that Province, it ought to be applied to British Columbia. Perhaps the best plan to pursue would be that adopted by the United States with reference to the Territories. There, no territory can be admitted as a State, unless it has a population something like 100,000, and until that number is realized, a very cheap form of territorial government is established. Each territory has the right to send one delegate to Congress—he may take part in debate but cannot vote. The territories of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Dacotah are the nearest parallel, adjoining as they do our North-Western frontier, they have a population of 73,674, according to the Census of 1870, yet they have no vote in Congress. In this connection, the following statement of the expenses of their territorial organizations will be interesting:—

Washington.

Population—Census 1870. 23,901

Area, miles. 69,944

Hon. Mr. Christie.

Governor.....	\$ 3,000	
Secretary of State.....	2,000	
Treasurer.....		fees
Auditor.....	500	
U. S. Attorney.....	250	and fees
3 Judicial districts with a prosecuting Attorney in each.....	200	and fees
Chief Justice and two Associates.....	2,500	each
Marshal.....	250	and fees
Lands to be disposed of.....	41,600,000	

Idaho.

Population, 1870.....	14,998	
Area.....	90,932	
Governor.....	\$ 2,500	
Secretary.....	2,000	
Treasurer.....		percentage.
Comptroller.....	2,000	
Supt. Instruction.....	1,600	
Judicial Districts with Chief Justice and two associates.....	3,500	
Revenue, 1867.....	64,059	26
Payments, “.....	58,005	76
	\$ 6,053	50
Total debt, Dec., 1868.....	\$100,558	25

Montana.

Population, 1870.....	20,594	
Area.....	143,776	
Governor.....	\$ 2,500	
Secretary.....	2,000	
Treasurer.....	700	and fees
Auditor.....	700	“
Attorney-General.....	200	“
Secretary Board of Agriculture.....	700	“
Supt. Public Instruction.....	700	“
Chief Justice and two associates.....	3,500	each
Receipts, 1866.....	56,620	50
Payments, “.....	56,346	10
	\$ 274	40
Total debt.....	\$110,786	47

Dakota.

Population, 1870.....	14,181	
Area.....	152,000	
Governor.....	1,500	
Secretary.....	1,800	
Treasurer.....	75	

Supt. Instruction.....	\$ 3 per day
Attorney-General.....	250 and fees
Chief Justice and two associates, each.....	2,500

These territories have only one delegate, each, in the House of Representatives, and are not represented in the Senate at all. Now in the case of British Columbia we propose to give her six members in the House of Commons, and three in the Senate, although her total population is only 15,000 at the highest estimate. I must say such an arrangement is altogether unjustifiable. It is not certain that even until the completion of the railroad, this representation will not be altogether disproportionate to the population. The exact state of the population, numerically, is not known, but includes a large number of Indians who are perfectly worthless. Mr. Arthur Harvey, in a pamphlet giving some statistics of the colony, says that the Indian population are really of no account in the labour market. We have the white population stated at 15,000, and they are represented to be of "extravagant and wasteful habits." At least, such is the character given them by Governor Musgrave himself; and yet they are to have this large representation in Parliament.

The Postmaster General said that the financial arrangements were published three months ago, and yet no opposition has been offered to them in the press. Now, this statement is not correct, for I have looked over the newspapers from Ontario since this question came before Parliament, and with very few exceptions they censure the arrangements. Even the *Toronto Telegraph* has opposed certain portions of the terms and regretted that they are of such a nature. The Postmaster General said that the revenue of British Columbia from customs, excise and postage, and steamers made a total of \$363,500. Then he gave the other side of the account: Interest on debt, \$100,000; Subsidy to Government, \$35,000; 80c. on 60,000 population, \$48,000; Pensions, judiciary, &c., \$30,000. I would like to know what proportion of this amount is for pensions.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—It is difficult to make an estimate of the pensions at present—all, or nearly all of them, may take service under the Dominion and render pensions unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE—We may then estimate the amount between four and six thousand dollars. This item is not large, but it strikes me as very objectionable in principle. I am not aware of any pensions having been granted in the initiation of Confederation. But to continue—the

amount for collection of Customs is put down at \$15,000; Mail, Steam and Telegraph, 63,800; Lighthouses, \$9,500; Militia and Geological Surveys, \$25,000; Hospitals, \$10,000. Then, we must add \$25,000 for the graving dock; \$100,000 for the payment of land. The total amount, therefore, will be \$461,300 against \$373,500, or \$97,800 annual cost above revenue. If we look into the local resources and expenditures, we find that the local revenue left by the Dominion amounts to \$151,000; 80 cents per head, \$48,000; subsidy, \$35,000; interest on debt, \$25,000. This makes a total amount of \$259,000 against an estimated expenditure of \$212,000, leaving a balance over expenditure of \$47,000 in favor of British Columbia. This, added to the \$97,800 before mentioned, gives the colony \$144,800, and represents the annual cost to the Dominion, over revenue, including the payment for land. The whole arrangement is most unfair to other sections of the Dominion, and the amount derived from the 80 cents and subsidy, nearly ten times the allowance to Ontario, according to population. Contrast the expenditure of \$212,000 in British Columbia with the \$56,000 or \$60,000 expended in the adjoining territories of Washington, Idaho, Montana and Dakota, and you will see how extravagant is the present propositions. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, speaking of the land grant, said that it was expected that the Province of Ontario would give some 9,000,000 of acres. Without discussing the quality of the land, I would ask what guarantee have we that the Government and Legislature of the Province of Ontario will give that grant. If we are to judge of the opinions of the Government by what we have seen in another place, we shall find the Treasurer of that Province voting against the scheme, from first to last. We find the Minister of Agriculture, it is true, voting the other way, but still, we have no reason to suppose—especially when we consider the present state of public opinion in the Province, as shown by the recent elections, that the grant will be given. With all due deference to the Postmaster General, I do not see that we are not bound to undertake the construction of the railway—he says we are only bound to *secure* its construction. What is the meaning of that phrase? Suppose that you cannot, by means of your land grant and subsidy induce a company to undertake it, what will you do? You have bound yourselves to *secure* the building of the road. You must either as a Government make it or pay for its construction. I think we may as well leave the land grant out of the calculation altogether. Starting from a point near Ottawa to the upper end of

Lake Superior, we find the country is not fit for agricultural purposes. Not until we get into the Red River country—where it is said there are some 60,000,000 acres of fertile land—is the land at all suitable for cultivation. West of this to the Pacific the country is almost worthless for agricultural purposes,—there is a good deal of mineral wealth, some valuable fisheries, but no farming lands. In conversation to-day with my friend, the Hon. Malcolm Cameron, I was informed by that gentleman that his own observation and all the information he could gather during a visit to that country in 1862, had led him to come to the conclusion that only very small portions of British Columbia could be made available for agricultural purposes. In the small interstitial valleys, there was fertile lands, but the quantity was very inconsiderable, and even those valleys were liable to inundation by the June torrents. The uplands were poor and rocky. The prairie portions were covered by a grass well known to Western men as “bunch grass,” unfit for pasture and indicating a poor, sterile soil. Mr. Cameron saw only two good farms in the whole country; they were on Vancouver’s Island, and had been made good by large expenditure of money. On his return to Canada Mr. Cameron gave a fair statement of the country and its resources for which he was assailed in strong terms in a letter signed by some forty persons from Canada, who had emigrated to British Columbia. They declared that Mr. Cameron’s statements were calculated to mislead Canadians, and were altogether too favourable to the country, which was unfit for agricultural purposes. The letter in question will be found in the *Toronto Globe* of the 18th February, 1863. It is signed by persons from various parts of Canada and many of them are well known to some of my hon. colleagues, as persons of respectability and industrious habits, who went there as pioneers of civilization. It is evident then that money and money alone must build this railway. My hon. friend the Postmaster General said that Canadian railways cost \$160,000,000, but these railways pass through the most populous and wealthy districts of Canada. In the case of the Canadian Pacific, it would pass through a wilderness, where it would cost a great deal to transport supplies and materials to the scene of operations. Then, after you have constructed the road, where will the traffic come from. The income of the Grand Trunk, the Great Western and the Northern Railways is estimated at a quarter of a million of dollars a week. The Grand Trunk gives no dividend, and the Great Western only 2½ p.c. at the most. How can you expect

Hon. Mr. Christie.

in a country without people or traffic, even such results from railway operations. Reference has been made to the resolution introduced into the other branch by Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier; but in my opinion, it amounts virtually to nothing. If the Government are sincere in bringing it forward, why do they not embody it in their resolutions. When I asked the Postmaster General why he did not do so, he replied that he could not amend a treaty; it could only be changed by being sent back to British Columbia. If this is a treaty, a mutual compact, how can you undertake to place a construction other than that justified by the terms of the treaty. You admit that that part of the treaty is dubious. What right has one party to the treaty to interpret it, and govern himself accordingly? If the Government is sincere, why have they not introduced the resolution into the Senate. So far it has not been placed before the House (hear, hear). I feel that I have trespassed on the time of the Senate, but I cannot vote for these resolutions, friendly though I am to Confederation, and sincerely desirous of seeing it a success. I believe that it is for the welfare of the people of this Dominion and of free government that we should build up a large power on the northern part of this continent. Still, I cannot, in justice to the interests of the people of the Dominion, especially of the industrious inhabitants of Ontario, vote for a proposition like that introduced by the Government, a proposition, as I believe, fraught with so much mischief.

Hon. Mr. McCLELLAN—Inasmuch as this question is of very considerable importance to the people of the Dominion of Canada, and it may be to the Empire, I cannot give a silent vote. The hon. member who addressed you previous to the former speaker (Hon. Mr. McFarlane) whilst ignoring the financial features of this scheme, defended it on the ground that it was a part of the Confederation scheme. Now, I have been from the beginning an advocate of the Union in the Province to which I belong, but I do not think it is my duty to carry the idea of Confederation to the extent which the hon. gentleman seems disposed to carry it. I am prepared to confess that the ultimate union by railway of the Atlantic with the Pacific has been to my mind a grand idea, but the mode of accomplishing this union is another question which this Parliament should consider carefully. I do not think that we should overleap the bounds of prudence so as to pass a measure which may be fatal to the success of Confederation itself. My hon. friend has stated that it is not to be a Government railway, but that it will be built by a company with large

land grants, supplemented by a money subsidy. My hon. friend would not tell us where the company is to be found, the amount of land or the amount of money, or the particular terms on which this subsidy would be allowed. He also forgot to allude to another very important point. Who are to use the road when it is built? Not for centuries to come can the country through which it is to pass be settled for more than one half its distance. We cannot fairly instance the progress in the United States. During the last twenty-five years the average number of immigrants landing in New York has been about 200,000 a year. That immigration alone has given a great stimulus to the construction of American railways—it made laborers plentiful and afforded the population necessary to take up lands along the route to organize States and build up towns and cities. We have not, however, reached that status in the Dominion by which emigrants from the old country are attracted to us in preference to the American Union. If instead of introducing a measure like this, likely to impose such heavy burthens on the country, we had organized some simple machinery for the improvement of the internal communications of British America as promised, so soon as finances would admit, and giving the facilities for trade by means of steam intercourse, then I would gladly support the Government. All this could have been done with very little expense, and then, we could have directed our attention to other matters of public moment. As respects the question of representation, I may say that when I agreed to the British North America Act, I thought we had some sort of a constitution—that we had something to which we could always refer, and which would not be departed from for the most trivial considerations; but now I find that the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, with an aggregate population of only 25,000, are given ten representatives in the House of Commons, whereas New Brunswick, with a population of 300,000, has only 15 members. Such a departure from the principles of the constitution, certainly does not seem to me just to the other Provinces. But it has been said unless we secure British Columbia now, she might be absorbed by the United States. We heard the same assertion during the agitation for the Confederation of Manitoba. I know very little about British Columbia, but I cannot believe there is any just cause for this aspersion of the loyalty of any portion of her people. I believe so long as the high tariff and the immense war debt exist in the United States, the cry for annexation will not find more followers in British Columbia than in other parts of the

Dominion. I believe, if this scheme be carried out, as we fear it will be, and as it clearly ought to be without any prevarication, if made a part of the treaty, it will impose such an enormous burthen upon the Dominion, that ten years hence our position will not be so favorable as it is now, and we will not be able to offer as many inducements as at present for maintaining British connection hitherto so highly prized; as the loyalty of the people will not be so strong when it becomes unprofitable. In conclusion, I will say that I am sorry that the gentlemen who represent New Brunswick in the Government, have so far forgotten their obligations to their Province, and to those to whom they are wholly indebted for their high position, as to have imposed upon it in common with other sections of the Dominion responsibilities which will be very hard to bear and which tend further to break up that constitution which received a sufficiently serious blow when additional concessions were made to Nova Scotia—a Province which has already received large sums, beyond the original agreement, and yet their grievances continue to be reiterated. Having been unable to occupy my seat, I have not had the pleasure of listening to the speeches of other hon. gentlemen on this great subject, but I have no hesitation in voting against the resolutions of the Government. It is very largely a subject of Imperial interest, and one which the people of this Dominion have not had time to maturely consider.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—I was very reluctant to say anything on the present question, as it has been already so fully discussed, but I have been called to my feet by the observations made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who has generally very clear views on public matters. I differ entirely from the hon. gentleman who comes from the same Province that I do. Certainly this is a very important question, one on which every one interested in the welfare of his country ought to express his opinions. Now I object to the amendment because it is at variance with the opinions expressed even by those who opposed the resolution, that we should unite with British Columbia. It means an indefinite postponement of the question, although all of them desire to see the union accomplished and the great West opened up. It is admitted that this is a question which the Senate can deal with—which it can accept or reject. More than that, we have the power in the rejection of it to pass a resolution by which we may express what modification of the terms we can give to British Columbia, and in that way facilitate the adjustment of this question. Holding

the opinions he does, the hon. member for Grandville should have been prepared to pursue this mode of procedure. It has been objected that British Columbia has had a better opportunity of expressing her views on the subject than the Parliament of Canada. Be that as it may, we have now an opportunity of making our opinions known. Now I am unwilling to postpone the question indefinitely. Desirous as I am of carrying out the great scheme of Confederation, I am prepared to say that although there may be some modification of the terms of the resolutions desirable; yet, upon the whole, I must support them as they are. Much stress has been laid on the amount of the subsidy and the financial terms given to British Columbia, as well as on the amount of representation. If the arrangement respecting representation were intended to be permanent, it would perpetuate a principle antagonistic to the Act of Union, and I would see something in the objections of hon. gentlemen; but it is evident that before the next census is taken this irregularity will be remedied. There is nothing in the resolutions before the Senate which will prevent the inequality being rectified whenever a readjustment of the representation is made. It is also quite obvious that if the resources of British Columbia are as great as they are represented to be, an immense tide of population must soon flow into the country in connection with the railway and the revenues of the Dominion thereby very largely increased. As to the parallel drawn by the hon. member on the other side (Hon. Mr. Christie) between the colony and the territories of the United States, I do not think it is correct. These territories belong to the United States, and they can establish what sort of Government they choose, but British Columbia has a political existence apart from the Dominion, and we cannot exercise any control over it with respect to its government. No one denies that British Columbia possesses many valuable resources, that it has the finest coal mines on the Pacific coast—in itself a great element of wealth—that it has fisheries which must be a very lucrative source of commerce, that it has gold, to an extent of which even yet we cannot form an accurate idea; besides many other minerals. What then is the great stumbling block? We are told it is the construction of the Pacific Railway, and much stress has been laid on the paying qualities of the roads which are in operation in this country and the United States. However, when we consider the advantages conferred by railways which have not paid, I must say I think that argument is not sufficient to

Hon. Mr. Botsford.

prevent the construction of a road which will cement the Union together. What would Canada do without the Grand Trunk Railway which carries its products to the sea? But there is a very important point with respect to this railway which some have averted to, and that is, which is the most favourable route for a line between the Atlantic and the Pacific. That recalls to my mind a circumstance which occurred some years ago when I was paying a visit to Washington in connection with the Reciprocity Treaty. There I became acquainted with many distinguished Americans, and among them was a gentleman of very high position who had travelled over the greater part of the North West, and he told me that if ever a convention was made for a treaty to settle the difficulties between England and the United States, it would be important for the interests of both countries that there should be an article in the treaty providing for the construction of an International Railway between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and Great Britain, he added, has the territory through which that railway should run (hear, hear). If the height of land will be 2,000 feet less than that found in the United States, it is evident that the cost of our line must be less than that of the American lines. Again, it is objected that British Columbia has the best of this arrangement. Now, the only portion of this railway which will be a direct advantage to British Columbia, is that from the pass in the Rocky Mountains to Vancouver Island, and I appeal to gentlemen if the colony would not be entitled to the construction of a road on the same terms as the Intercolonial for which a guarantee has been given. When we came into the Union, it was with a certain proportion of debt, but this loan for the completion of the Intercolonial railway did not form a portion of it. British Columbia will now come in and pay her proportion of the loan, and who is benefited—the Lower Provinces; and, therefore, I say that this stipulation with respect to the railway, is not too favorable to the colony. I believe we are destined to be a great and powerful and happy people, and, therefore, I am ready to run some risk, but I believe the construction of the railway will actually promote the development of our resources and increase our wealth. As respects the construction of the road, I must say here that I trust the narrow gauge will be adopted, and in that event, the road will be built much more economically. What will be the population ten years hence—if we are as prosperous as I hope we will be? Not less than 7,000,000, and the revenue under the present tariff will not be less than \$25,000,000. Our present public debt

has not been incurred in devastating wars, but has arisen from expenditures for useful public works. Some of these works do not pay much, but still they are invaluable to the country. Do we not see the men of the Western States saying that they must have the use of the St. Lawrence as the natural outlet for their enormous traffic? Will not these public works become more remunerative according as we improve them and make them equal to the requirements of trade. One reason why I have little faith in the apprehensions which have been expressed by some Senators in this House is this: I heard the same predictions when the Union of the Provinces took place. I heard men of education and intelligence, say most positively that the country would be depopulated—that ruin and bankruptcy would ensue; and now with the experience of the past three years, we see the fallacy of these forebodings. I have been an advocate of the Union of the Provinces, ever since the time of Lord Durham. I believe this Union must give us more influence in the Councils of other countries. We have an independent, enlightened and vigorous people to develop our resources, we have institutions of the most liberal character, and a country rich in all the elements of wealth, and with all these advantages, it will be our own fault if we fail in attaining a great future. Therefore, I am not afraid to spend one hundred millions of money, if it were necessary, to open up the great North West in which I have the most unbounded confidence. The Government, who failed to grapple with this question, would have fallen before public opinion, and other men would have taken their places and adopted the same vigorous policy for carrying out this great scheme. It has been said that England wishes to get rid of her colonies. I do not believe it, but this road will certainly benefit her and give her a greater interest than ever in this country. More than that, I believe she will express her willingness to aid in the construction of this great work; but if the British Government are not ready to give us money or a guarantee, is it not probable or possible that they will adopt a policy which will increase our wealth and at the same time relieve the people of England of a burthen which is now weighing heavily upon them. Every one is aware of the immense amount required to support the poor of England. Thousands are able and willing to work, but they find it impossible to get employment in consequence of the surplus of labour. Would it not then be a wise measure for the Parliament of England to assist a large bulk of these people in finding their way to the North West. With these remarks,

and apologizing for having trespassed so long on the patience of the House, I must conclude by expressing my opinion that the resolutions are deserving of the support of all the friends of Union.

Hon. Mr. BENSON—I have been always in favour of Confederation, and have endeavoured to forward it to the best of my ability. Since I have been a member of the Legislature I have given every vote to promote the Union, and I see no reason now why I should refuse to support this measure, for I do not view it as some gentlemen do, as beyond our resources, as likely to impose a burden of \$100,000,000 on the country. I believe that the measure will be carried out faithfully, in accordance with the promise of the Government, and therefore I cannot support the amendment. I cannot believe that any Government, now or hereafter, would introduce a measure which would embarrass this country to the extent some gentlemen predict. I believe this measure will be for the advantage of the whole Dominion. Everybody has admitted that British Columbia should come into the Union—that was one of the conditions of the original Confederation scheme, and giving her communication with the rest in the Dominion. I consider it is the duty of the Government to construct the railway as soon as we can do so within our resources. I think that the road will be commenced within two years and completed at the time contemplated, and by means of the land grant and the money subsidy. Under these circumstances it gives me much pleasure to vote for the resolutions introduced by the Government. I believe they will have the effect of strengthening the Dominion and giving an additional stimulus to its great resources (hear).

Hon. Mr. ODELL—Knowing the sanguine temperament of my hon. friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Botsford), I am not surprised to hear the opinions he has expressed. In justice to him I must acknowledge that he has always enunciated these views, but I scarcely expected him to go as far as he has done to-day. He tells us that even \$100,000,000 or more, would not deter him from voting for this measure. He tells us also that it is the duty of the Government to deal with this question. I quite agree with him, but I think it was also the duty of the Government to deal with it in such a way as to be acceptable to the country and not to cripple our resources. He undertakes to inform us what the Government propose to do, and what sort of railway they will build, but he forgot to tell us what the Government are going to do hereafter when this heavy burden is imposed on the country. Now, I have been

absent from the country for the past six months, and have not had an opportunity of enquiring into the state of public opinion, but all I can gather respecting the views of the people of New Brunswick, leads me to believe there is a very strong feeling of opposition to the measure. Although I admit that we are here to legislate for the Dominion at large, and that we are not actually representatives of the people, at the same time I hold we are bound in some measure to consider the wishes of the different sections for which we have been selected. I confess that I was astounded when this scheme was put into my hands on my arrival here, and I felt at the outset that this government in their hot haste to form the connection had been over-reached by the delegates and legislature of British Columbia. I am not surprised that British Columbia should insist on obtaining the best terms she could acquire, and I believe she was influenced, to a large extent, by the previous legislation of this Dominion, in respect to other provinces. I have no doubt, that the terms which were offered to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and the additional concessions made in the case of Nova Scotia, have led the people of British Columbia to suppose that they could exact any terms they wished from the Government of the Dominion. I object also to the mode in which this matter has been submitted—I am strongly of opinion that in the case of an important measure like this, we should be consulted with respect to the details. I have listened attentively to see why it is we cannot exercise what is our right and privilege, and am told that this is a treaty which we must accept or reject as a whole; and yet we find that the little colony of British Columbia has had the right to express its opinion upon the details through the Legislature and through the people. I have heard no objections to the admission of British Columbia upon any fair terms, and no objections to a reasonable subsidy for a railway, and therefore there is no excuse for the course pursued, which is humiliating to this House. I find that every one who has referred to this question has spoken of it as part of the Confederation, and it would seem that our present votes are to be guided by our past action with regard to that scheme. Now, as respects myself, let me say at once, that when the people of New Brunswick changed their minds upon the question and decided in its favour, I withdrew my opposition to it, as I proved by the fact of my acceptance of a seat in this House. On no occasion have I endeavored to throw any obstacles in the way of the completion of the work. I am glad when

Hon. Mr. Odell.

the scheme works well, but at the same time I am quite aware that there are some differences of opinion with respect to its operation. I hope that such feelings will soon disappear, if even-handed justice is meted out. But if we undertake all these extravagant expenditures we may depend upon it that there will be a reaction against Confederation. I have heard a great many glowing descriptions and fancy sketches with respect to this Union and railway scheme—Great Empire—Interoceanic road—Eastern trade—a picture all sunshine, verdure and beauty. But let us reverse the picture and paint the same landscape when the storm clouds sweep across the heavens, and the hurricane devastates the land, lashing the sea into fury until it rises in its majesty and engulphs everything on its surface—I do not desire to paint such a picture. I believe the truth lies somewhere between the two extremes. With prudence and economy we may go on prosperously, and probably be able to meet all our present liabilities in the course of time; but it may be different if we burthen ourselves in the way proposed for the sake of admitting an insignificant and distant colony into the Confederation. If the golden accounts that have been given of British Columbia be true—if it has all the rich resources and the magnificent climate so often referred to since this debate commenced—how is it that it has not attracted immigration, and that its capabilities have never yet been developed? Why have not lumbering operations been profitably carried on there, as here and in New Brunswick, without subsidies, and long before the introduction of railways? Why have not these valuable Fisheries we hear of been long ago prosecuted as in Nova Scotia? We are told, on the other hand, that we must give these large subsidies to British Columbia to meet her necessities or she will annex herself to the United States. This she dare not do without the consent of the Mother Country, and I will not do her people the injustice to believe they desire it. But if the country is as rich as it is represented to be it ought to be better able to maintain itself. I might follow the example of others and present calculations with respect to the building of a railway—seldom, indeed, in this House has such an array of figures been presented—but after all what are they based upon? There is no man within these walls or outside that can undertake to say what the cost of this railway will be until we have an accurate and scientific survey. I do not believe any persons can be found capable of expressing an accurate opinion of the whole country through which it is to pass. Some may know portions of it and that is all. Still

here we find the Minister of Marine and Fisheries actually dividing it into sections, and estimating the cost of each. He might as well attempt to tell you how many fins the fish in the Pacific possess. The figures are valueless. No one can tell what amount this railway will eventually entail upon us, whether one hundred or two hundred million dollars, and is this a sum to be trifled with.

I had recently the pleasure of meeting a gentleman from British Columbia, and the information he gave me with respect to the country appeared to me reliable. He could not help expressing the astonishment which the people of the Colony felt at the terms which had been agreed to by the Government of the Dominion. He made this remark afterwards, where is the money to come from? I replied I was under the impression that we would find it very difficult to raise funds for the construction of the road, except at a ruinous rate of interest. The state of Europe was such that no one would be inclined to invest, England would have enough to do to hold her own, and manage her affairs without getting involved in such speculations. He told me there was a great deal of valuable pine timber in the country, but it would be found very difficult to get it to market as they had no snow roads, that the large trees very often broke in falling and that being resinous pine the stumps did not rot for ages and that there were no means of reducing them—some were so large that they had actually built a billiard room on one—so that clearing the land was very expensive. They had gold but were obliged to mine so deeply for it, it was not profitable. Copper in abundance—but that was abundant everywhere. With all the information before me I do not think we can derive much revenue from the resources of British Columbia. If we are to pay the expenses of their Government and everything connected with it—if we are to build this railway, why too are we called upon to pay \$100,000 for the right of way through the country which they ought to give freely. The mode of submitting the measures—the fictitious Population, the disproportionate representations, five per cent on the difference of indebtedness per head calculated on 60,000 instead of 10,000 in section 2. and the 100,000 for Railway lands are all objections, but minor objections, which might be got over. Now I have come to the Railway, the real *stumbling block* in this matter so called by the supporters of the scheme. Even the eloquent member from Nova Scotia [Mr. Miller], was brought to a stand still for a moment, but he succeeded at last in getting over it in a very peculiar manner. When repeating old Confederation speeches

he spoke of the Intercolonial Railway and the Halifax Terminus, though once I believe an anti, he was very fluent, but when he came to the *stumbling block* he looked first on this side, then on that, finally he struck his spurs in Pegasus, but Pegasus with the aid of his wings could not get over. Then recollecting the French Balloons he inhaled a little more gas up, up he went off into the clouds, over the Rocky Mountains, to the shores of the Pacific; but by and by the gas escaped, down came the balloon and nobody was hurt, (Laughter).

But there stands the *stumbling block*.

The Hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) was also brought up at this same *stumbling block*, but he got over it in a very different way. He said he meant to be candid, but he was far too candid—his views about the scheme were such that I could not for the moment conceive how it would be possible for him to vote for it. But he managed to get over the difficulty at last in a sort of logical way—he said the railway would bring money to the terminus—Halifax would be the terminus; and therefore he must support it in the interest of Nova Scotia. I find, however, I cannot get over this *stumbling block* in any way whatever. In my opinion no language can be stronger than that used in the 11th section with respect to the railway. The Government undertake to secure its commencement in two years and complete it in ten. We have been told that there is another resolution somewhere; but we know nothing about it, and even supposing it were passed it could not affect this solemn treaty. This resolution may bind the hon. gentleman to vote for it, but only so long as they choose. British Columbia might say that she does not put the same construction on the treaty and refuse to come into the Union. Under all the circumstances, therefore, it is advisable to give further consideration to this matter and not bind ourselves to build this railway and incur all these expenditures so recklessly. I do not consider this a Government measure, nor do I view it in any party light. I believe we are legislating with regard to posterity. After the general election another Government might come in, and in such an event I would vote in the same way if a similar question were brought up. Ever since I have been in this Senate I have been struck by the great ability, good sense and urbanity, with which the hon. Post master-General has always conducted the business in the House, and feeling this, I have always a great desire to support him; but on the present occasion I cannot do so, although he has assured us that it is not the intention of the Government to go

into any such extravagant expenditures but that they intend to be bound by the resolution which has been introduced in another place. If that hon. gentleman had the sole direction of this matter, I would accept his assurances, but changes may and must in the natural course of events occur, and we do not know who will be called upon to deal with this question in the course of the next ten years. Therefore I cannot now strain at a gnat and swallow a Campbell.

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER said that he had been waiting until that late hour to see whether an answer would be given by members of the Government or other gentlemen who supported the resolutions, to the point that had been raised by the hon. member for the Wellington Division, as to the constitutionality of the proceedings with respect to the admission of British Columbia. It had been said that the Queen had no power to issue an Order in Council appointing three new members to the House. No answer, however, had yet been given by the Government and he was not aware of any legal gentleman who had attempted to stand up and controvert the position assumed by the hon. member. He thought the hon. member for Nova Scotia (Mr. Dickey) referred to the question but only in a very cursory manner, and he concluded by saying at last that he left the whole responsibility in this matter in the hands of the Government. Now, when we considered the mistake we made last year in connection with the Manitoba Bill, we should act more cautiously and prevent a similar mistake. In this connection Mr. Oliver went on to refer to the 146, 147, 22 and following clauses of the British North America Act to prove the accuracy of his argument and urged that there was no power given to appoint Senators; that the provision in the 60th clause referred to the additional appointment of three or six members, at any time, to be taken equally from the three sections named in the Act, in fact the whole language and spirit of the Act showed the intention to have the three divisions of country equally represented in the Senate. Now, by the proposed scheme, he argued, the proposed equality was to be disturbed contrary to the language of this Act.

The hon. gentleman then went on to refer to some of the details of the resolutions, and in the course of his remarks asked whether the Judges of the Superior Courts were to be also Judges of the County Courts.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL could not say what the judicial system of the colony was at present.

Hon. Mr. OLIVIER supposed that there
Hon. Mr. Odell.

was no intention to include the Stipendiary Magistrates in the list of Judiciary; and, in that case, if they were not employed under the name of County Judges or Magistrates, we must provide pensions for them. At the time of Confederation he had put a question to the hon. leader of the Government with respect to the debt of the Canadas, and got for an answer:

Hon Sir E. P. Tache: All the details are not included in the resolutions; but as to the balance of \$5,000,000 which will have to be divided between Upper and Lower Canada, and which constitutes the difference between the \$62,000,000 of debt which will be assumed by the Confederation and the \$67,000,000 which Canada owes, a division will be made before Parliament is dissolved.

The amount was now nearly three times that stated in the foregoing paragraph; and, therefore, he was very suspicious of any explanations given him now by the Government. He had no doubt the Postmaster-General was serious when he tried to make the House understand that by the 11th clause of the present resolutions we were not binding ourselves to build the road; but it was very questionable whether that honourable gentleman, now that the excitement of debate had passed away, would be ready to express the same opinion quite so emphatically. It was said that by means of a resolution presented to the other House we were to explain the meaning of the resolutions, but he could not understand how one of the contracting parties could give an interpretation to a treaty. He supposed a case of three gentlemen whom he would call respectively, John Minister, Frank Canada and Sharp Columbia. John was the agent and had bound Frank Canada to build a house for \$20,000 for Sharp Columbia. Frank Canada then said to John Minister, "How is it you bound me to build a house for \$20,000 when I have not the means of paying for it?" Suppose the agent should then go to his chief and say, "I made the arrangement, not with the intention of binding you but we will make a counter deed and, and, although you are bound in the Treaty itself to do it, stipulate that the reverse is the fact." None would presume that the Agent acted honorably, or that the principal had the right to countenance his action. Was it come to such a point in this country that we were prepared to forfeit our pledges? He for one considered the resolutions bound the country by the most solemn pledge and could not see how the Government could do otherwise than follow their literal construction.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON (who was only im-

perfectly heard) said that, like other gentlemen who had preceded him, he was unwilling to give a silent vote on a question of such magnitude. He could not see how the Government could evade the obligations which devolved upon them under the resolution. He was positive that the road could not be built under the terms proposed, and that the Government would have to assume an enormous burthen—probably \$150,000,000—if it wished to keep faith with the people of British Columbia. He did not see where the Government itself could sell the bonds necessary to construct the undertaking. He had himself little belief that the new territory was ever going to add to the wealth of the Dominion. He had known persons who had laboured industriously to make a living in the country, and had failed at the last. The fact that the population was now actually less than it was some years ago was a proof of the poverty of the country.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER said that he had just given a letter of recommendation to a gentleman in Montreal, an intelligent business man, who would leave the next day for British Columbia, on account of inducements held out by some relatives, who had been living for many years in the country.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON went on to refer to the duties now levied in the colony, even onions, and other vegetables were taxed, and ridiculed the idea of a union with such a wretched colony. He considered the whole scheme as most absurd, and expressed his surprise that any Government, anxious to promote the welfare of this country, should have agreed to accept the terms. He did not see there was any particular reason for dealing with so important a question in such hot haste, and was forced under the circumstances to vote for the amendment.

Hon. Mr. FLINT dissented from the views expressed by the last speaker, and denied that he truly represented the state of public sentiment on the question. It was absurd for any one to calculate the cost which the country would have to assume in connection with the railway—he was quite assured that no Government would dare to burthen the Dominion to any serious extent. He went on to refer to the present prosperous condition of Canada, and its ability to meet all such expenditures as would probably be incurred in assisting the construction of a work which would of itself develop our resources to an incalculable degree, by opening up a large and valuable country and new sources of wealth on all sides. He was surprised to hear the hon. member depreciate the

lands, especially as he could have little or no practical knowledge of the country of which he professed to speak. It was quite probable that some persons had failed to be successful in British Columbia, but that was the case everywhere. Men would always be found wanting in those qualities of energy and perseverance which are essential to success in life.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD interrupted the hon. member to mention that a young man was present, who had just come from British Columbia and intended to return there immediately with others who would be willing to accompany him.

Hon. Mr. FLINT went on to say that when Confederation had been carried he felt bound to accept the situation and endeavour, as far as he possibly could, to make it work satisfactorily. He had not been satisfied with the course which had been taken in bringing about Confederation—he did not like the coalition of political parties for that purpose. Nevertheless, the scheme had been worked out so far by a coalition Government, and until it is fully completed, he hoped that they would remain in office. He was not, however, pledged to support all their measures, but he felt it his duty on the present occasion to vote in behalf of the resolutions. He was anxious to make the Union a success and perpetuate the connection with England. He believed that the people of Ontario were as loyal as those of any other portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. Some persons might be found ready to join the American Union, but he was certain that if the voices of the immense majority were heard, they would declare for the continuance of British connection [hear, hear].

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST.—I regret exceedingly being obliged to impose another speech upon the House. When I made my motion in amendment the other day I took occasion to speak in French, but I think now after the views that have been expressed on the subject since this debate opened I am entitled to some favor from the House, and hon. gentlemen will permit me to answer some of the arguments that have been advanced why the resolutions proposed by the Government should pass. When the Postmaster General introduced the question he said that he did not consider there was any difference of opinion between those who assisted in framing, and those who opposed the Confederation of British America, as to the advisability of allowing British Columbia admission into the Union. In reply I must say that any remarks which I may make must not be taken as unfriendly to Confederation, but as exhi-

biting a desire to make the measure more acceptable and more in consonance with the interests of this country. I am ready to admit that as colonies of Great Britain, or with a view to our future national independence or even with the possibility of our annexation to the Great American Republic, the consolidation of all the colonies of British North America must take place and is desirable, provided it is secured by means adequate to our circumstances, and that such a consolidation is effected with prudence and due regard to our actual liabilities and to our financial abilities. I said the first time I spoke on the question that we are deranging the basis on which the representation of the country is established. We have had quite difficulties enough previous to Confederation to warn us now of the danger of constitutional innovations. We have had great difficulties on this very score—we opposed the principle as destructive of the Act of Union into which we had entered against our will with Upper Canada. But the very men who opposed representation by population were the first to jump up and say that they would assist in passing Confederation on that basis. From that moment they have admitted that principle—it is a part of our Constitution. But what are they doing now? They are giving the West a larger influence as compared with Lower Canada, at direct variance with the very Act of Union. Then the Postmaster General went on to refer to the second part of the question—the money arrangement. Although I am not prepared to admit that the terms are fair to the other Provinces, nevertheless we consider them less objectionable than the other part of the scheme. We have said little comparatively about them, for we might have been considered as giving a factious opposition to the resolutions. As respects the question of the railway it has been said by the Government that this scheme is not entirely in the nature of a treaty, and that we may by certain legislation dispose of the absolute clause in the resolutions. Now that clause says that the Government pledges itself to commence the road within two years' time and complete it within ten years, so as to connect with the network of railways in Canada. We have been told that this railway will be at least 2,500 miles in length. We say, before we enter into such a colossal undertaking, we wish to see your estimates; but in reply we are told, "You may make them yourselves." When a scheme of such magnitude is placed before the country the Government are bound to place before this House and country some estimate of the cost. When we enquire what are the difficulties we have to encounter we are told that they are

not greater than those the Americans have had to meet in connection with railways to the Pacific. When we ask the number of bridges, or the quantity of iron that will be required, we have not a word from the Government in reply. In the case of an individual, when he commences any large enterprise, he makes an estimate of the expense to see if he has the means of carrying it out; but here we are to take a leap in the dark. But we are met by the general observation that a large country like this which has been progressing so rapidly may go into the present enterprise without incurring any danger. No one can say that this doctrine is sound—on the contrary it is fraught with danger. If you build the road according to the estimates which have been given of similar works in the United States it will cost over \$100,000,000. Taking the figures which have been given by the members of the Government we find that the sum of \$25,000,000 would represent the bonus to be given by the Dominion, and taking the highest price estimated for the land grant we have another sum of 32 or 35 millions, making \$57,000,000 altogether, to build a road which cost so much more in the United States. Under these circumstances I ask ought the Government to embark in what would be certainly a most hazardous undertaking. I have been told that the road will not cost us anything—that it will be built by Companies paid in lands. Suppose we do not find a Company willing to undertake the work. The hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Ferrier) said that a Company would offer before next session; but if it is so easy to procure one now, why not secure one beforehand and give the House the information which is now wanting. If we cannot procure one now are we likely to do so when it is clear that the road will not cost less than \$150,000,000, the most accurate estimate probably.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—I spoke of what I hoped to see realized—that we shall have three or four companies before next year asking to construct this work.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Notwithstanding my high respect for the hon. member I cannot believe that we can expect any such result with \$32,000,000 of land and \$25,000,000 of money.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—The land on the Northern Pacific is now selling at \$7 or \$8 an acre.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I know that lands in this country have never brought such a price. More than that, in Ontario, where the lands are of superior character a large quantity remain unpaid in the hands of the Government. It is the same in the Province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. Le Tellier de St. Just.

And these lands were granted at from 1s. 6d. to 5s. an acre.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—The prairie lands are far superior to those of which you are speaking.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I am ready to admit the value of the prairie lands, but as far as the country between Lake of the Woods and Upper Canada is concerned, there may be spots of good soil, but the rest is barren, whatever the Minister of Marine may say to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I gave you the best authority on the subject.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—I am not saying all the land is bad, but two-thirds, at least, is arid, barren, cut up by lakes and rivers. As soon as we have crossed the swamps of the Lake of the Woods we come to the prairie lands and they extend as far as the south branch of the river Saskatchewan. I admit these lands are splendid, but I do say that from that branch you do not find such lands until you come a little north near Fort a la Corne. I know it is impossible to grow wheat or even barley on these prairie lands—they succeed with vegetables—I know this to be a fact from relatives of mine who are living there. Or take the reports we have of this country—that of Hind, for instance,—he gives no good account of the greater portion of this country. Under these circumstances I think we should pause before incurring an expenditure of \$150,000,000 and learn something about the country through which the road is to pass. Why are we imposing such a burden at this moment? We are told that it is necessary that we should unite with British Columbia, and this I admit; but is a railway necessary to keep up the connection? We have been connected for a long time with Great Britain without any such bond of union. My hon. friend near me (Hon. Mr. Macpherson) said that if this scheme is to be carried on by the opening of a road from the east he hardly thought it was within the means of the country to accomplish it; but he added that the most feasible mode was to get into the Manitoba country by forming a conjunction with the American roads.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—I said that the only feasible way with our present means and information was to get the requisite facilities by using the American railways and commencing our own at Pembina.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN—Perhaps the Postmaster General would give us some information on this point, and tell us whether the Government adopt the views of the hon. member from Toronto?

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—I have nothing to do with the Government in the matter. I know that the great obstacle is the country between Lake Nipissing and Fort Garry, and I wish to avoid any large expenditure at present.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—The Premier of the Government stated elsewhere that the road was to be built from some place near Lake Nipissing as far as the Rocky Mountains; but I think the Postmaster General should be more explicit on this subject,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The Government are not pledged to any particular point—that is a question not yet determined—certainly we do not propose to construct a railway in the United States.—(Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—What I do complain of is the manner in which the Government gives information to the House. Whenever they are asked for information on any particular point they are most vague and evasive in their replies. I take it for granted that for the sake of contradicting the liberal views of the hon. member for Toronto, the Postmaster General is ready to allow this matter to stand in this dubious state; but it is not the same with the hon. Receiver General (Mr. Chapais) who told us, with grave solemnity, that he would never consent to see our communications with British Columbia carried on even partially over American railways; that it would be contrary to the policy of the Government, and moreover, a link of railway from Fort Garry to Pembina to combine with the American Pacific Railroad would be a dangerous policy. But the most extraordinary statement on his part was that if such a communication was opened, the Americans would pour into our territory of Manitoba, that they would settle on the lands of the Province, and later that they would annex Manitoba to the Great Republic as they did in the case of Texas. Well now, hon. gentlemen, these contradictions from the Hon. Postmaster General, and the ridiculous narrow views of the Hon. Receiver General on the advantages of such an immigration, need no better answer than their absurdity. The cost of this Pacific Railway is a matter upon which the Government admit they are unable to give us any information; and in the position in which this Parliament is most unjustifiably placed in being asked to act blindfold, no other mode of ascertaining the magnitude of its cost and of its difficulties is left to us, than to examine certain reports made by engineers, or by comparison either with our Intercolonial or with the American Pacific Railroad. Before going briefly into

this examination, I think, by enlarging the views entertained by the hon. member for Toronto, that British Columbia as well as Manitoba could comparatively be placed in communication with the Dominion at a very insignificant outlay; first, by the opening of a link between Fort Garry and Pembina where the American Pacific Railway will have an extension in a very short time from this, and, secondly, by building a link on the shores of the Pacific from British Columbia to the Northern Pacific Railway, which the Americans are now building; affording to our two sister colonies the advantages of mutual communication, and of partaking of all the advantages of the great railway networks of the United States and of Canada. Then, hon. gentleman, Manitoba and British Columbia, having these facilities, could we not, without prejudice to their interest and with advantage to this Dominion, await the future, when after due examination, we could afford to open more direct communications through British territory. Taking this mere practical view of the case we would not impose upon this dominion, a burthen that might be ruinous and affect our credit in the money market by the execution of works presenting so many difficulties in point of execution as well as in a financial point of view. Now, I take the report of Mr. Fleming on this very railway, and I find that it cannot be safely constructed with our present means; that it must be attended with great difficulties which we cannot well overcome. I will quote a few extracts from this report; and I must say at the outset that, if there is a document from which the Government ought to have obtained information it is this: "Measuring on the map along the general route of the proposed line from the mouth of Fraser's River to one of the best passages yet discovered in the Rocky Mountains along the general direction of the 'Fertile Belt,' keeping South of the North Saskatchewan, crossing the Red River near the settlement, bridging the Winnipeg River at the North end of the Lake of the Woods, striking through the country to the most northerly bend of the shore of Lake Superior, thence in a direct line to a crossing on the French River, west of Lake Nipissing, and from this point connecting with the existing railway system of Canada, either at the town of Barrie, or at Peterboro, or at the city of Ottawa.

"That a just conception may be formed of the real magnitude of the project under discussion, and the means necessary to its attainment, attention may for a moment be drawn to a few leading details.

"The construction of 2,000 miles of railway measured by the average standard of similar works existing in this Country

implies the performance of labourer's work sufficient to give employment to 10,000 men for five or six years, it involves the delivery of 5,000,000 cross ties or sleepers, and over 200,000 tons of iron rails for the "permanent way;" it comprises the erection of 60,000 poles hung with 1,000 tons of wire of the telegraph; it necessitates the creation of motive power equivalent to over 50,000 horses, which power would be concentrated in 400 locomotives; it involves the production of from 5,000 to 6000 cars of all kinds, which coupled with the locomotives, would make a single train over 30 miles in length; and lastly, it implies a gross expenditure on construction and equipment of not less than \$100,000,000.

"It will likewise serve as a salutary check on hasty conclusions, to weigh before hand the cost of operating a truly gigantic establishment of the kind after its perfect completion: a few figures derived from actual results will show that the first construction of railway through the interior of British North America is even a less formidable undertaking, than that of keeping it afterwards open in the present condition of the Country. For operating the line successfully, the fuel alone required in each year, and estimated as wood, would considerably exceed 200,000 cords; for keeping the roads in repair, a regiment of 2,000 trackmen would constantly be employed in small gangs through out its entire length; for the same purpose, there would, on an average, be annually required 600,000 new cross ties, as well as nearly 30,000 tons of new or re-rolled iron rails—the annual repairs of rolling stock would not cost less than one million dollars—over 5,000 employees of all kinds would constantly be under pay, and as these men would usually represent each a family, there would not be far short of 20,000 souls subsisting by the operation of the road. The aggregate amount of ways in each year after the road was in operation would swell out to nearly \$2,000,000, while the gross expenditure for operating and maintaining works would annually exceed \$8,000,000.

"Again, if to this last sum be added the interest on first cost, it becomes evident that until the gross earnings of the railway in each year come up to the enormous sum of \$14,000,000, it could not pay interest on the capital invested."

It has been stated very incorrectly by hon. the Receiver General that the American Pacific Railroad was built with grants of lands only. Well, I may state, for his information, that this is not the case, for, according to the facts as stated in the American Annual Cyclopaedia (1869) he will see that the Pacific Railroad was com-

Hon. Mr. Le Tellier de St. Just.

pleted on the 10th of May, 1867, by the junction of the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific Railroads; that this rapid progress was largely due to the aid rendered by the General Government, that the Union Pacific Railroad was largely patronized by a Government possessing the means of doing so, by larger grants of land than those proposed for our railway, and by a direct assistance in bonds of that Government maturing in 30 years bearing six per cent interest payable in gold; that subsequently the company obtained the right to issue its first mortgage to an amount equal to the bonds of the Government, which were made a second lien on the road, making an aggregate of \$58,685,000 to start with—and moreover that a short time ago the contractors were dispensed of paying the interest on the Government Bonds for a period of thirty years.

And now that this important route is accomplished, we may find there some data that might give us an approximative idea of the liabilities we shall incur if this scheme is adopted.

The average cost of building the Pacific was at the rate of \$68,058 per mile for 914 miles west from Omaha, and \$90,000 per mile for 186 miles. Let us take the lowest of the two figures per mile for over 2,700 miles, and the result will be for the cost of construction \$187,756,600.

If we consider the cost of the Intercolonial, which may be safely put at \$25,000,000, though under far more favorable conditions for its construction, we find that the cost per mile cannot be less than \$50,000, which is equal to Mr. Fleming's estimate of the Canadian Route, upon which he has pronounced the following judgment:

"The idea of constructing upwards of 2,000 miles of railway in the manner which has characterized the establishment of similar undertakings heretofore, through a country almost uninhabited except by scattered bands of wandering Indians, may well be viewed as a commercial absurdity. It has been shown that the maintaining and operating of a railway of this extent, after its perfect completion, would cost not less than eight millions dollars per annum, and that its traffic would have to yield in gross receipts fourteen millions of dollars every year to enable the work to pay interest on the capital invested.

"Could it be satisfactorily shown that these receipts might even be approached, the work would undoubtedly be a legitimate investment for private capital, and we might fairly expect to see it undertaken by private enterprise; but at present no such inducement can be held out; however important the line would be in

many respects the business of the country traversed could not for many years yield more than a fractional part of the revenue required to keep it open, and the traffic from ocean to ocean could not be expected even by the most sanguine to give constant and profitable employment to a force of four hundred locomotives without which the road would scarcely pay...."

It is all very well for the promoters of this scheme to come forward and say that you need not be afraid if companies will not work this railway. The hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Ferrier) would be in a quandary, if, when the road is finished, we were to grant him all the plant and rolling stock on the condition that he would keep the road in running order.

Hon. Mr. FERRIER—Ten years hence matters will be even better than they are now.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST--We cannot forecast the future. I will not trouble the House with any more extracts from Mr. Fleming's Report, but I will ask hon. gentlemen to consider calmly and seriously whether what I have laid before you—the result of the reflection and experience of the Chief Government Engineer—is such as to induce you to give your adhesion to this rash scheme of railway construction. There is a man who has been employed for years by the government, who has himself constructed railways, and he tells us that we are going into an undertaking of 2000 miles which it will cost \$14,000,000 to maintain. We were told that the Grand Trunk Railway had been a great benefit to the country; but that road has not been built by this country but by the earnings of the people of England who have assisted in opening up Canada when she had not the means herself of doing it, but who have never received a dollar in return. The shareholders have given some fifteen or sixteen millions of dollars to develop our resources, but they have received no benefit or thanks from us. The present road would be an enormous burthen on us during its construction, and would be ever applying to us for additional assistance to keep it running. Why, it would require some 400 locomotives alone—enough to carry off the whole population of British Columbia. The expense of construction must be greatly increased compared with the Intercolonial Railway, which runs through a country where there are high roads, water communications—the means of carrying materials and provisions along the route; but none of these facilities exist in the case of the Pacific Railway. The total cost of the Intercolonial is put down

at \$20,000,000, or perhaps \$25,000,000 rather, and yet is only one-sixth of the distance. If you multiply the \$25,000,000 by six you have \$150,000,000 as the probable cost of the Pacific. I very much fear—I regret to say it—that our political status will be lowered by the course which the Government are pursuing in this matter. We bind ourselves to construct a railway to the Pacific—the pledge is clear and unequivocal; but we are told that there is a resolution which, instead of adopting the language of the treaty, undertakes to state the mode in which the road shall be built. We are, therefore in our legislation placing on record a decision which is contrary to the letter of a treaty which the Government of Canada has entered into with the Government of British Columbia. Is that a dignified attitude for this Parliament to take? No, we are lowering ourselves in the eyes of the world—acting in a manner derogatory to our honor. In the case of San Domingo the American Senate would not accept a treaty made by the Washington Government; and the consequence was that a Commission has been sent to the Island to enquire into its condition and the advisability of annexation. Let us act fairly and honorably with the people of British Columbia, let us tell them we must amend these terms, we are willing to admit them into the union on equitable conditions but not otherwise. I think it is our duty as legislators to shew by our debates that we are willing to admit the colony on terms fair to both parties, and refuse to lend ourselves to the promulgation of a mere delusion. I am sure that the result of this debate will have its influence upon public opinion, whatever may be the fate of these resolutions. We certainly do not expect to see the Government defeated on this question—it would indeed be no defeat so far as this House is concerned. I regret to say that some members have adopted the view that if these resolutions are not carried, it would be a vote of want of confidence; but it is a mistake to suppose any such thing. Before this, I have seen the measures of the Government defeated in the Senate, but still they have continued in office. One of the reasons given why we can safely deal with this question is the satisfactory condition of our finances. I am glad this is the case, but is that an excuse for now acting recklessly and extravagantly. Many great public improvements, promised at the inception of the Union, require to be carried out, and the longer they are delayed the greater the injustice to the Provinces now forming the Union. For instance, here is my hon. friend from Nova Scotia who is such an

Hon. Mr. LeTellier de St. Just.

earnest advocate for the construction of the Bay Verte Canal; but can he expect to see that important work undertaken by the Government, if the country launches into the expenditure necessary for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Then there is the improvement of our canal system generally—the deepening of the Welland and the St. Lawrence Canals, the improvement of the river navigation. All these are questions of the deepest moment to the commercial interest of the whole Dominion, and it would be very unfortunate were they neglected. Then there is another question which is of deep interest to us in Lower Canada—the question of the Arbitration—which, according to the unjust award recently made, will place against Quebec a liability of about \$5,000,000. This liability must be adjusted in some way or other, though it is quite certain Quebec will not willingly agree to the exaction. This debt ought to be assumed by the Federal Government with compensation to the Maritime Provinces, but our financial position will be so much affected by that scheme that our federal exchequer will feel unable to meet this case. When we consider the questions of Canals and Arbitration, you cannot expect that the country will be able to incur a liability of \$150,000,000 in connection with the Pacific Railway. If we do incur it, then ruin and misery stare us in the face. Hon. gentlemen may indulge in pleasing visions, but the issue is nevertheless inevitable. I am not against this scheme *in toto*, but I am against that portion of it which seems to me inopportune and ruinous. As the Hon. Receiver General is not in his place, I will not attempt to follow him at length. He told us of the manner in which he had managed the department of Agriculture when he was at the head of it. He referred to explorations which he had ordered of the Lake St. John, and endeavoured to prove that I had been very unfortunate in respect to public roads, and plumed himself on the fact of his success in finding roads. Then he carried us to the Lake Temiscouata road, then to Mount Denis, where two nations have just shook hands through the mountain range which has long divided them, and he has told us of the construction of a railway over the same mountains to the Simpon, while the tunnel was being constructed beneath; all this to show that we need not be afraid of going into lavish expenses and great enterprizes, and to prove that, if such extraordinary feats had been achieved, we were able to do as much. Taking his mode of arguing I could demonstrate that others have attempted more and had failed, and considering that this hon. gentleman's efficiency has been confined to the most pious

duties of the Government of this country, and considering his peculiarities, I have, when passing through the library this morning, opened a book in which he certainly must have great confidence—the old Testament—and I may add that the first passage that struck my eye was a striking allegory which answers perfectly to his mode of arguing, and which is as follows: Genisis xi, verse 1-9, “And the whole earth was of one language and was of one speech, and it came to pass, as they journeyed from the East, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and they said, go to, let us build us a city and a town, whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, and scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth; and they left off to build the city; therefore, is the name of it called Babel, because the Lord did then confound the language of all the earth.”

If this scheme is carried, it is very probable that the people of this Dominion will cause the members of the Government to be scattered upon the whole face of the Dominion, but provided the finances of this country are not scattered, there will be no cause for complaint.

I must thank you, hon. gentlemen, for your kind attention to my remarks in reply to the hon. gentlemen who have addressed this House on my amendment, and I do hope that this discussion will prove that this branch of the legislature is alive to the interests of the country, and that this Senate could not vote silently upon this amendment to these resolutions without failing in its duties.

Before I conclude I will simply say that I hope, whatever may be the result of the division on these resolutions, the House will believe that all who have spoken for or against them have been influenced by conscientious and patriotic motives, and that if I have made a mistake in bringing forward my amendment, my error must be considered one of judgment and not of oblivion to the true interests of my country (cheers)

The question of concurrence was then put on the amendment moved by Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just, and the House divided as follows:—

CONTENTS:—The Hon. Messrs. Chaffers, Christie, Cormier, Dickson, Glasier, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McMaster, Malhiot, Odell, Olivier, Reesor, Sanborn, Seymour, Simpson, Steeves, Tessier, Wark, Wilmot, Wilson.—21.

NON-CONTENTS.—Aikins, Allan, Archi-

bald, Armand, Benson, Bill, Botsford, Bourinot, Burnham, Campbell, Chapais, Churchill, Dever, Dickey, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Flint, Foster, Guevremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Holmes, Kenny (Sir Edward), McDonald, McLelan, Macfarlane, MacPherson, Miller, Mitchell, Northup, Panet, Perry, Read, Renaud, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Smith.—39.

So it passed in the negative.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN then moved in amendment, seconded, by the Hon. Mr. REESOR, that all the words after “3 Resolved” be struck out and the following inserted,—"While this House desires the early union of British Columbia with the Dominion, and is prepared to adopt any plan, consistent with a prudent and fair estimate of the resources of this country, to secure this result, it cannot, with a due regard to our financial ability, concur in the terms set forth in said Address and Report imposing upon this Government the absolute obligation to secure the completion of a railway communication between the Pacific coast and the railway system of Canada."

The question of concurrence being put thereon, the House divided, and the names were taken down as follows:—

CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Chaffers, Christie, Cormier, Dickson, Glasier, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McMaster, Malhiot, Odell, Olivier, Reesor, Sanborn, Seymour, Simpson, Steeves, Tessier, Wark, Wilmot, Wilson.—21.

NON-CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Aikins, Allan, Archibald, Armand, Benson, Bill, Botsford, Bourinot, Burnham, Campbell, Chapais, Churchill, Dever, Dickey, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Flint, Foster, Guevremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Holmes, Kenny (Sir Edward), Lacoste, Macdonald, McLelan, Macfarlane, Macpherson, Miller, Mitchell, Northup, Panet, Perry, Read, Renaud, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Smith.—39.

So it passed in the negative.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved in amendment, seconded by Hon. Mr. Leonard, That the said Resolutions be amended by inserting before the figure and the word “3. Resolved” the following Resolution:—

“That the Railway referred to in the said Address and approved report of the Committee of the Privy Council, should be constructed and worked by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government, and that the public aid to be given to secure that undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy and money, or other aid, not unduly pressing on the industry and resources of

the Dominion as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine."

The question of concurrence being put thereon, the House divided, with the same result.—21 to 39.

So it passed in the negative.

The question being put on the main motion, the House divided, and the names were taken down as follows:

CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Aikins, Allan, Archibald, Armand, Benson, Bill, Botsford, Bourinot, Burnham, Campbell, Chapais, Churchill, Dever, Dickey, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Flint, Foster, Guevremont, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Holmes, Kenny (Sir Edward), Lacoste, McDonald, McLelan, Macfarlane, Macpherson, Miller, Mitchell, Northup, Panet, Perry, Read, Ryan, Shaw, Skead, Smith.—38.

NON CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Chaffers, Christie, Cormier, Dickson, Glasier, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McMaster, Malhiot, Odell, Olivier, Reesor, Sanborn, Seymour, Simpson, Steeves, Tessier, Wark, Wilmot, Wilson.—21.

So it was resolved in the affirmative.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL then moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. MITCHELL, That an Address embodying the said Resolutions be presented to Her Majesty, and a Select Committee composed of the Hon. Sir Edward Kenny, and the Hon. Messrs. Flint, Botsford, Dickey, Armand, and the mover, be appointed to draw up the said Address.

The motion was carried and the House was adjourned during pleasure.

After some time the House was resumed, and

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL reported from the Committee the following Address:

ADDRESS.

To the Queen's Excellent Majesty.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of *Canada* in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing:—

That by a Despatch from the Governor of *British Columbia*, dated 23rd January, 1871, with other papers laid before this House by message from His Excellency the Governor General, of the 27th February last, this House learns that the Legislative Council of that Colony, in Council assembled, adopted in January last an Address representing to Your Majesty that *British Columbia* was prepared to enter into Union with the Dominion of *Canada*, upon the terms and conditions mentioned in the said Address, which is as follows:

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Members of the Legislative Council of *British Columbia* in Council assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing:—

Hon. Mr. Sanborn.

That, during the last Session of the late Legislative Council, the subject of the admission of the Colony of *British Columbia* into the Union or Dominion of *Canada* was taken into consideration, and a Resolution on the subject was agreed to, embodying the terms upon which it was proposed that this Colony should enter the Union;

That, after considerable discussion by the Delegates with the Members of the Government of the Dominion of *Canada*, the Terms and Conditions hereinafter specified were adopted by a Committee of the Privy Council of *Canada*, and were by them reported to the Governor General for his approval:

That such Terms were communicated to the Government of this Colony by the Governor General of *Canada*, in a Despatch dated July 7th, 1870, and are as follows:

1. *Canada* shall be liable for the Debts and Liabilities of *British Columbia* existing at the time of the Union.

2. British *Columbia* not having incurred debts equal to those of the other Provinces now constituting the Dominion, shall be entitled to receive by half yearly payments in advance from the General Government, interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum on the difference between the actual amount of its indebtedness at the date of the Union, and the indebtedness per head of the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, \$27.77, the population of *British Columbia* being taken at 60,000.

3. The following sums shall be paid by *Canada* to *British Columbia* for the support of its Government and Legislature, to wit, an Annual Subsidy of \$35,000 and an Annual Grant equal to 80 cents per head of the said population of 60,000, both half-yearly in advance, such Grant of 80 cents per head to be augmented in proportion to the increase of population, as may be shown by each subsequent decennial census, until the population amounts to 400,000, at which rate such Grant shall thereafter remain, it being understood that the first census be taken in the year 1881.

4. The Dominion will provide an efficient mail service, fortnightly, by steam communication between Victoria and San Francisco, and twice a week between Victoria and Olympia; the vessels to be adapted for the conveyance of freight and passengers.

5. *Canada* will assume and defray the charges for the following services:—

- A. Salary of the Lieutenant Governor;
- B. Salaries and Allowances of the Judges of the Superior Courts and the County or District Courts;
- C. The charges in respect to the Department of Customs;
- D. The Postal and Telegraphic Services.
- E. Protection and Encouragement of Fisheries
- F. Provision for the Militia;
- G. Lighthouses, Buoys, and Beacons, Shipwrecked Crews, Quarantine and Marine Hospitals, including a Marine Hospital at Victoria;
- H. The Geological Survey;
- I. The Penitentiary;

And such further charges as may be incident to and connected with the services which by the *British North America Act* of 1867 appertain to the General Government, and as are or may be allowed to the other Provinces.

6. Suitable Pensions, such as shall be approved of by Her Majesty's Government, shall be provided by the Government of the Dominion for those of Her Majesty's Servants in the Colony whose position and emoluments derived therefrom would be affected by political changes on the admission of *British Columbia* into the Dominion of *Canada*.

7. It is agreed that the existing Customs Tariff and Excise Duties shall continue in force in *British Columbia* until the Railway from the Pacific Coast and the system of Railways in *Canada* are connected, unless the Legislature of *British Columbia* should sooner decide to accept the Tariff and Excise Laws of *Canada*. When Customs and Excise Duties are, at the time of the Union of *British Columbia* with *Canada*, leviable on any

Goods, Wares, or Merchandizes in British Columbia, or in the other Provinces of the Dominion, those Goods, Wares, and Merchandizes may, from and after the Union, be imported into British Columbia from the Provinces now composing the Dominion, or from either of those Provinces into British Columbia, on proof of payment of the Customs or Excise Duties leviable thereon in the Province of Exportation, and on payment of such further amount (if any) of Customs or Excise Duties as are leviable thereon in the Province of Importation. This arrangement to have no force or effect after the assimilation of the Tariff and Excise Duties of British Columbia with those of the Dominion.

8. British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by Three Members, and by Six Members in the House of Commons. The representation to be increased under the provisions of the *British North America Act, 1867.*"

9. The influence of the Dominion Government will be used to secure the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt.

10. The provisions of the *British North America Act, 1867,*" shall (except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to and only affect one and not the whole of the Provinces now comprising the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Minute) be applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other Provinces of the Dominion, and as if the Colony of British Columbia had been one of the Provinces originally united by the said Act.

11. The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of a Railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected, East of the Rocky Mountains, towards the Pacific, to connect the sea-board of British Columbia with the Railway system of Canada; and further, to secure the completion of such Railway within ten years from the date of the Union.

And the Government of British Columbia agree to convey to the Dominion Government, in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable in furtherance of the construction of the said Railway, a similar extent of Public Lands along the line of Railway throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed, however, twenty (20) miles on each side of the said line, as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion Government from the Public Lands in the North West Territories and the Province of Manitoba. Provided that the quantity of land which may be held under Pre-emption right or by Crown Grant within the limits of the trust of land in British Columbia to be so conveyed to the Dominion Government shall be made good to the Dominion from contiguous Public Lands; and provided further, that until the commencement, within two years, as aforesaid, from the date of the Union, of the construction of the said Railway, the Government of British Columbia shall not sell or alienate any further portions of the Public Lands of British Columbia in any other way than under right of Pre-emption, requiring actual residence of the Pre-emptor on the land claimed by him. In consideration of the land to be so conveyed in aid of the construction of the said Railway, the Dominion Government agree to pay to British Columbia from the date of the Union, the sum of \$100,000 per annum, in half yearly payments in advance.

12. The Dominion Government shall guarantee the interest for ten years from the date of the completion of the works, at the rate of five per centum per annum, on such sum, not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class graving dock at Esquimalt.

13. The charge of the Indians, and the trusteeship and management of the lands reserved for their use and benefit, shall be assumed by the Dominion Government, and a policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia

Government shall be continued by the Dominion Government after the Union.

To carry out such policy, tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose, shall from time to time be conveyed by the Local Government to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefit of Indians on application of the Dominion Government; and in case of disagreement between the two Governments respecting the quantity of such tracts of land to be so granted, the matter shall be referred for the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

14. The constitution of the Executive Authority and of the Legislature of British Columbia shall, subject to the provisions of the "*British North America Act, 1867,*" continue as existing at the time of the Union until altered under the authority of the said Act, it being at the same time understood that the Government of the Dominion will readily consent to the introduction of responsible Government when desired by the inhabitants of British Columbia, and it being likewise understood that it is the intention of the Governor of British Columbia, under the authority of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to amend the existing Constitution of the Legislature by providing that a majority of its Members shall be elective.

The Union shall take effect according to the foregoing terms and conditions on such day as Her Majesty by and with the advice of Her Most Honourable Privy Council may appoint (on addresses from the Legislature of the Colony of British Columbia and of the Houses of Parliament of Canada in the terms of the 146th section of the *British North America Act, 1867,* and British Columbia may in its address specify the electoral districts for which the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons shall take place.

That such terms have proved generally acceptable to the people of this Colony.

That this Council is, therefore, willing to enter into Union with the Dominion of Canada upon such terms, and humbly submit that, under the circumstances, it is expedient that the admission of this Colony into such Union, as aforesaid, should be effected at as early a date as may be found practicable under the provisions of the 146th section of the *British North America Act, 1867.*

We, therefore, humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased, by and with the advice of Your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, under the Provisions of the 146th section of the "*British North America Act, 1867,*" to admit British Columbia into the Union or Dominion of Canada on the basis of the terms and conditions offered to this Colony by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, hereinbefore set forth; and inasmuch as by the said terms British Columbia is empowered in its Address to specify the electoral districts for which the first election of Members to serve in the House of Commons shall take place, we humbly pray that such electoral districts may be declared, under the Order in Council, to be as follows:—

That "New Westminster District" and "Coast District" as defined in a public notice issued from the Lands and Works Office on the 15th day of December, 1869, by the desire of the Governor, and purporting to be in accordance with the provisions of the 39th clause of the "Mineral Ordinance, 1869," shall constitute one district, to be designated "New Westminster District," and return one Member.

That "Cariboo District" and "Lillooet District" as specified in the said public notice, shall constitute one District, to be designated "Cariboo District," and return One Member.

That "Yale District," and "Kootenay District," as specified in the said public notice, shall constitute one district, to be designated "Yale District," and return One Member.

That those portions of Vancouver Island known as "Victoria District," Esquimalt District," and

"Metchoin District," as defined in the official maps of those Districts in the Land Office, Victoria, and which maps are designated respectively, "Victoria District Official Map, A.D. 1858," "Esquimalt District Official Map, 1858," and "Metchoin District Official Map, A.D. 1858," shall constitute one district to be designated "Victoria District," and return Two Members.

And, that all the remainder of Vancouver Island, and all such islands adjacent thereto as were formerly dependencies of the late Colony of Vancouver Island District shall constitute one District, to be designated "Vancouver Island District," and return One Member.

We further humbly represent, that the proposed terms and conditions of Union of British Columbia with Canada, as stated in the said Address, are in conformity with those preliminarily agreed upon between delegates from British Columbia and the Members of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and embodied in a Report of a Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 1st July, 1870, which approved Report is as follows:—

Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 1st July, 1870.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a Despatch, dated 7th May, 1870, from the Governor of British Columbia, together with certain resolutions submitted by the Government of that colony to the Legislative Council thereof—both hereunto annexed—on the subject of the proposed union of British Columbia with the Dominion of Canada; and after several interviews between them and the Honorable Messrs. Trutch, Helmcken, and Carrall, the Delegates from British Columbia and full discussion with them of the various questions connected with that important subject, the Committee now respectfully submit for your Excellency's approval the following terms and conditions to form the basis of a political union between British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada.

1. Canada shall be liable for the debts and liabilities of British Columbia existing at the time of the Union

2. British Columbia not having incurred debts equal to those of the other Provinces now constituting the Dominion, shall be entitled to receive by half yearly payments, in advance, from the General Government, interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum, on the difference between the actual amount of its indebtedness at the date of the Union, and the indebtedness per head of the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, \$27.77 the population of British Columbia being taken at 60,000.

3. The following sums shall be paid by Canada to British Columbia for the support of its Government and Legislature, to wit: an annual subsidy of \$35,000, and an annual grant equal to 80 cents per head of the said population of 60,000, both half-yearly in advance, such grant of 80 cents per head to be augmented in proportion to the increase of population, as may be shown by each subsequent decennial census, until the population amounts to 400,000, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain, it being understood that the first census shall be taken in the year 1881.

The Dominion will provide an efficient mail service fortnightly by steam communication between Victoria and San Francisco, and twice a week between Victoria and Olympia, the vessels to be adapted for the conveyance of freight and passengers.

5. Canada will assume and defray the charges for the following services:—

- A. Salary of the Lieutenant Governor.
- B. Salaries and allowances of the Judges of the Superior Courts and the County or District Courts.
- C. The charges in respect to the Department of Customs.
- D. The postal and telegraphic services.
- E. Protection and encouragement of fisheries.

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

F. Provision for Militia.

G. Lighthouses, buoys and beacons, shipwrecked crews, quarantine and marine hospitals, including a marine hospital at Victoria.

H. The Geological Survey.

I. The Penitentiary.

And such further charges as may be incident to and connected with the services which by the British North America Act of 1867, appertain to the General Government, and as are or may be allowed to the other Provinces.

6. Suitable pensions, such as shall be approved by Her Majesty's Government, shall be provided by the Government of the Dominion for those of Her Majesty's servants in the colony whose position and emoluments derived therefrom would be affected by political changes on the admission of British Columbia into the Dominion of Canada.

7. It is agreed that the existing customs tariff and excise duties, shall continue in force in British Columbia until the railway from the Pacific coast and the system of railways in Canada are connected, unless the Legislature of British Columbia should sooner decide to accept the tariff and excise laws of Canada. When customs and excise duties are, at the time of the union of British Columbia with Canada, leviable on any goods, wares or merchandizes in British Columbia or in the other Provinces of the Dominion these goods, wares and merchandizes may, from and after the Union be imported into British Columbia from the Provinces now composing the Dominion, or from either of those Provinces into British Columbia, on proof of payment of the customs or excise duties leviable thereon, in the Province of exportation, and on payment of such farther amount, if any, of customs or excise duties as are leviable thereon in the Province of importation. This arrangement to have no force or effect after the assimilation of the tariff and excise duties of British Columbia with those of the Dominion.

8. British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by three members and by six members in the House of Commons. The representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

9. The influence of the Dominion Government will be used to secure the continued maintenance of the Naval Station at Esquimalt.

10. The provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall [except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to, and only affect one and not the whole of the Provinces comprising the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this minute] be applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other Provinces of the Dominion, and as if the Colony of British Columbia had been one of the Provinces originally united by the said Act.

11. The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement, simultaneously, within two years from the date of the union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected East of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and, further to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the Union.

And the Government of British Columbia agree to convey to the Dominion Government in trust to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable in furtherance of the construction of the said railway, a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed, however, twenty (20) on each side of the said line, as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion Government from the public lands in the North West Territories and the Province of Manitoba. Provided that the quantity of land which may be held under pre-emption right or by Crown grant

within the limits of the tract of land in British Columbia to be so conveyed to the Dominion Government, shall be made good to the Dominion from contiguous lands, and provided further, that until the commencement, within two years as aforesaid from the date of the Union, of the construction of the said railway, the Government of British Columbia shall not sell or alienate any further portion of the public lands of British Columbia in any other way than under right of pre-emption, requiring actual residence of the pre-emptor on the land claimed by him. In consideration of the land to be so conveyed in aid of the construction of the said railway, the Dominion Government agree to pay to British Columbia, from the date of the Union, the sum of \$100,000 per annum, in half-yearly payments in advance.

12. The Dominion Government shall guarantee the interest for ten years from the date of the completion of the works at the rate of five per centum per annum on such sum, not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class graving dock at Esquimalt.

13. The charge of the Indians and the trusteeship and management of the lands reserved for their use and benefit, shall be assumed by the Dominion Government, and a policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia Government, shall be continued by the Dominion Government after the Union. To carry out such policy, tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose, shall from time to time be conveyed by the Local Government to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefit of the Indians, on application of the Dominion Government, and in case of disagreement between the two Governments respecting the quantity of such tracts of land to be so granted, the matter shall be referred for the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

14. The constitution of the Executive authority and of the Legislature of British Columbia shall, subject to the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, continue as existing at the time of the Union until altered under the authority of said Act, it being at the same time understood that the Government of the Dominion will readily consent to the introduction of responsible government when desired by the inhabitants of British Columbia, and it being likewise understood that it is the intention of the Governor of British Columbia, under the authority of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to amend the existing constitution of the Legislature by providing that a majority of its members shall be elective.

The Union shall take effect, according to the foregoing terms and conditions, on such day as Her Majesty, by and with the advice of Her Most Honourable Privy Council may appoint (on addresses from the Legislature of the Colony of British Columbia, and of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada in the terms of the 146th section of the British North America Act, 1867), and British Columbia may in its address specify the electoral districts for which the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons shall take place.

(Certified,)

WM. H. LEE,
Clerk Privy Council.

We further humbly represent that we concur in the terms and conditions of Union set forth in the said Address, and approved Report of the Committee of the Privy Council above mentioned; and most respectfully pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased, by and with the advice of Your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, under the 146th clause of "The British North America Act, 1867," to unite British Columbia with the Dominion of Canada, on the terms and conditions above set forth.

The House then took up the Orders of the Day, and having gone through them, adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 5th, 1871.

After routine,

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved, that the House do, to-morrow, go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the 19th section of the Act passed in the now last session of Parliament, chapter 9, respecting Customs and Inland Revenue, by reducing to 63 cents per gallon, the duty of excise of sixty-five cents per gallon thereby imposed on spirits manufactured from molasses in bond.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER introduced a Bill to extend to the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia certain Acts therein named.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the object of the Government was to bring this session to a close as soon as possible. He would, therefore like, if the House would approve of it, to have a sitting on Monday, which was a statutory holiday, from one to six o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. MILLS—And Good Friday, too?

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that Friday was a religious holiday, and it might do violence to the religious principles of hon. members. He moved a resolution in accordance with his notification.—Carried.

Mr. DELORME was introduced by Mr. DONALD SMITH and Hon. Mr. BLANCHET, and took his seat on the Government side of the House, next to Mr. Donald Smith.

A message from His Excellency transmitting the Supplementary Estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1872, was read.

RAILWAY GAUGE.

Hon. Sir. F HINCKS moved the further consideration of Resolution 95, Intercolonial Railway, as reported from the Committee of Supply on the 23rd inst.

The resolution was read a first time.

On the motion for a second reading,

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL moved that the following words be added to the resolution: "provided that the gauge of such railway shall not be greater than 4 ft. 8½ in." He had no desire to trouble the House with a speech. He believed that the arguments advanced in favour of the narrow gauge when this subject was under discussion before remained unanswered—in fact, were unanswerable.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the resolution was contrary to the law fixing the gauge at 5 ft. 6 in. Besides it would involve an ex-

penditure of \$1,000,000 to change the gauge.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—How is that?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the road from Halifax to Truro, and from Amherst to Moncton, was 5 ft. 6 in., and, of course, if that portion of the road were changed, the gauge of the European and American Railway must also be changed. Otherwise the line would be interrupted by that portion of the Intercolonial Railway which extended from Moncton to Pausac Junction. There were the two alternatives—either to construct the road on the broad gauge principle or to adopt the narrow gauge at a cost of \$1,000,000. Then it must be remembered that the Grand Trunk gauge was broad, and if this resolution were carried it would be necessary to break bulk at Riviere du Loup.

Mr. DUFRESNE raised a point of order. The resolution, if carried, would entail an increased expenditure, and, consequently, should be preceded by a Message from His Excellency.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. member proceeded on the assumption that it would entail an increase of expenditure, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought differently. He believed it would effect a large saving instead.

At the suggestion of Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN the point of order was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL regretted that the Government did not adopt his resolution. As for the objection urged against it, that the law as it stood fixed the gauge at 5 ft. 6 in., he would remind the hon. member that this resolution, if passed, would have the force of law. The change of gauge would not entail a large increase of expenditure, for there was ample proof that it could be done speedily and cheaply. Then, too, the broad gauge of the Grand Trunk need not interfere with this line, for the new style of cars were readily adapted to any gauge, and the portion of the Grand Trunk line between Detroit and Port Huron was, he believed, a narrow gauge road. He had no intention to bring a want of confidence vote against the Government. His sole object was to promote economy in the construction of the railway.

Mr. SHANLY was himself in favor of the narrow gauge, but he believed it should be adopted gradually, and by arrangements with other existing companies. He would, therefore, advise that the resolution be dropped for the present.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET said his individual opinion was in favour of the narrow gauge, but it would be necessary to alter the gauge of the Grand Trunk if it were adopted on

the Intercolonial line. He did not feel that it would be fair to entail the cost of a change on the country at present, and he would therefore vote against the resolution.

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD was in favour of the narrow gauge if it could be adopted gradually. The track east of Montreal might be left unchanged for a time, but the road between Montreal and Toronto might be altered to advantage. The sliding axle cars he believed to be a mere make-shift which could not serve the country long. He believed this matter should be left over till some arrangement for a general change could be made with existing lines.

Mr. WORKMAN was in favour of an immediate change to the narrow gauge on all Government lines, and of the construction on the narrow gauge system of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE said there were only 149 miles of railway connected with the Intercolonial line to be changed. This, taking the estimate of the Great Western Railway, would require an expenditure of only a trifle over \$10,000 to change the gauge. At all events it would be cheaper and better to adopt the narrow gauge at once than to leave it for a future time. The question was, whether it was better to maintain an unsuitable gauge simply because an existing company was too poor to adopt the narrow gauge. It was for these reasons that he was ready to adopt the motion of the hon. member for Lanark. He did so through no hostile spirit towards the Government, but simply on national economical grounds. He was fully satisfied that it would be to the advantage of the country to adopt the narrow American gauge on all our national highways, and to require private companies to do the same with theirs.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said there was no provision in the contract for a change of gauge, as the law provided definitely that the gauge should be 5 ft. 6 in. Enquiries had been made, and it was estimated that to change the gauge of the Government railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would cost \$100,000, and to change the parts mentioned by the member for Lambton might cost about \$400,000.

Mr. WALSH (Norfolk) said a change of gauge would involve much more difficulty now than if it had been done earlier. On enquiry it was found that the changeable cars system could not be applied to passenger cars, but to freight cars only. Of course the Intercolonial might have been built on the narrow gauge system, but under the present system, considering the amount under contract, and the

Hon. Mr. Langevin.

amount of rolling stock under order, such could hardly be done. A change at the present time would involve a large expenditure, and whatever might be the advantage of the narrow gauge system as an abstract principle he did not think it advisable to alter now.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the whole difficulty of altering the rolling stock might be obviated by running a third line on the links connecting the Intercolonial.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the change of the gauge of the Intercolonial could not be considered alone and without taking into account the gauge of the Grand Trunk and of the railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The law as at present decided the gauge, and would have to be repealed before a change could be made. Waiving this, however, there was the matter of the business of the Railway. A change of gauge at Riviere du Loup would destroy a large portion of the traffic, and would induce forwarders to send it to the Lower Provinces by St. John and Portland. Then again the Pacific Railway was to be built within ten years, and there was no doubt the gauge would be narrow. The other railways on the line of communication were broad gauge, and so there would be one break only, whereas, if the Intercolonial Railway were built on the narrow gauge, there would be two breaks, and a very large amount of traffic would be lost. The Intercolonial could only be changed when the Grand Trunk was changed, and that company had decided that the construction and the working of the broad gauge was very little different to the narrow gauge. They had worked both systems, and had concluded that there was not sufficient material difference to induce a change of gauge. Of course the Grand Trunk Railway might consent to change their gauge if assisted by Parliament, but Parliament would hardly do that. A uniform gauge of the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial would be a great advantage in inducing traffic. The Great Western Railway had been cited, but that Railway was only a short line, and was rather a link of the American lines, and was very different from the Grand Trunk Railway. He desired to show that the Grand Trunk Railway had no inducement to change their gauge, and it was important that the Intercolonial gauge should be uniform with the Grand Trunk. He thought the matter should not now be interfered with.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said there could be no difficulty in changing the law so as to allow a change of gauge. It was admitted that the narrow gauge was intrinsically better, and superior in enabling a connection with American lines, and, further,

that the change would have to be made some time. It therefore, remained to decide only when the change should be made and he thought the great weight of argument shewed that the change should be made now. As to the statements respecting the G. T. R. he remembered that Mr. Brydges had on a former occasion stated before the Railway Committee that he preferred the narrow gauge. He hoped the motion of the member for Lanark should carry as he had heard no good argument against it.

Hon. Mr. BOLTON said the private Railway companies in New Brunswick had come to the conclusion that they would have to change their gauge to the narrow to connect with the American Railways in the State of Maine. He was a strong advocate of the narrow gauge and hoped the Government would consider the matter.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER had listened attentively to hear whether the member for Grenville would confirm the statement that the narrow gauge was much superior in point of cost and efficiency. The matter had been fully enquired into, and the Government had ascertained definitely that the difference in the construction and working of the two gauges was not very material. The question was whether the House was disposed to expend \$1,000,000 in changing the gauge of 300 miles of railway in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Lambton seemed to think that the change was not necessarily involved, but the branch lines in those Provinces would be useless unless of a uniform gauge with the Intercolonial. The change of the gauge of these 300 miles of branch lines, would cost according to the estimate of the ablest engineers that could be obtained, \$1,000,000. This however, was not the greatest difficulty. The point was, that unless the House was prepared to grant a loan of \$3,000,000 to enable the G. T. R. to change their gauge, they would for a great many years to come, if the Intercolonial gauge were changed, diminish very considerably the traffic that would otherwise be obtained, by making necessary a break of bulk at Riviere du Loup. Under these circumstances he thought the House would be disposed to act in conformity with the suggestion of the Hon. Member for Grenville, that the wisest course would be to construct the Intercolonial on the same gauge as the G. T. R., and make the change at such a time as that Company should be in a position to change its gauge.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) said it would be a national gain to adopt the narrow gauge and this was the most favorable time to do it. It seemed to him there

was more anxiety displayed to favor the Grand Trunk than to further the interests of the public.

Mr. JOLY spoke in favor of the amendment.

Mr. A. P. MACDONALD said the principal saving in the narrow gauge was in the embankments, culverts and sleepers, still, he did not approve of injuring the Grand Trunk by forcing them to adopt the narrow gauge. Their road had proved to be of immense benefit to this country, and he did not believe that obstacles should be thrown in their way.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas) believed that the narrow gauge should be adopted, and that the Grand Trunk should be aided in changing the gauge of their line. The House had swallowed a hundred million dollar scheme the other day, and he did not see why they should stick at two or three millions of dollars now. He believed the Government should take a couple of days to consider the matter, and adopt the narrow gauge system if it was proved to be the better one for the country.

A division was then taken on the amendment, which was—Yeas, 75; nays, 78.

YEAS.—Messrs. Abbot, Ault, Bèchard, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowell, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Costigan, Currier, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dobbie, Dorion, Drew, Ferris, Fortier, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones (Leeds & Grenville), Killam, Langlois, Lawson, MacDougall (Glengarry), McDonald (Middlesex), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McDonald [Lanark], MacDougall [Renfrew] McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison [Victoria O.], Munroe, Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pouliot, Pozer, Redford, Ross [Dundas], Ross [Prince Edward], Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Ryan [Montreal West], Rymal, Scatcherd, Scriver, Snider, Sproat, Stirton, Thompson [Haldimand], Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [East Hastings], Whitehead, Wilson, Wood, Workman, Wright [Ottawa County], Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.] and Young—75.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bourassa, Bown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Chipman, Cimon, Coffin, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Daoust, Delorme [Provencher], Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hncks [Sir Francis], Howe, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte

Mr. Macdonald.

Langevin, Lapum, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], MacCallum, MacDougall [Three Rivers], McMillan, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Smith, (Selkirk), Smith (Westmoreland), Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, and Webb.—78.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL moved, in amendment, that the following words be added, "and the rails to be used shall be of iron, similar to that used in the ordinary railways of the country."

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said contracts had already been given for steel rails, and the motion should not therefore be pressed, as great difficulty would ensue, and the contractors might not be willing to give up their contracts. The steel rails would be cheaper in the long run.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) maintained that iron rails were sufficiently good for the purposes of the railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that he desired to state the difference in the cost of the rails. Steel rails would cost about \$60 a ton while iron rails would cost about \$37 a ton. It was now generally admitted by the best authorities that even where the traffic was large it was only necessary to have steel rails on excessive grades, and this system had been adopted by a large company in England. He should, therefore, support the motion of the hon. member for Lanark, and as to the argument that the contracts had already been given, it would be much better to pay the contractors a reasonable amount of damage than rush into such an enormous expense unnecessarily.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that he had already stated that the Government had determined to use steel rails after obtaining the opinion of the very highest professional men in this country and in England, and they had been assured that on the grounds of economy alone steel rails were preferable. A large committee of the House had gone fully into the matter of the expenditure on the Intercolonial, and, although they had examined the Chief Engineer and the member for Grenville, they had not asked either gentleman a single question as to the relative value of steel and iron rails, which could only be because considering the elaborate reports laid before them they came to the conclusion that the Government had used a wise discretion in the matter.

In reply to Hon. Mr. BOLTON (Charlottesville) Mr. WALSH (Norfolk) stated that the specifications for the steel rails were

prepared by the Chief Engineer, and the contracts were given in accordance with those specifications. It had been considered, in discussing the style of the road, that as the appropriation for the construction was ample, and as the line for some years to come might not prove a very profitable undertaking commercially, it was desirable that the road should be really first-class so as to avoid any great expenditure for maintenance in the immediate future.

Mr. BLAKE said that the appropriation being ample, and the traffic not being likely to be heavy, were strong reasons for economy in the expenditure.

The amendment was then put and lost—Yeas, 62; nays, 88; and the main motion was carried, the resolutions being read a second time.

YEAS.—Béchar, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Burpee, Burton, Carmichael, Cartwright, Cheval, Crawford [Brockville], Crawford [Leeds], Delorme, (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Godin, Grover, Hagar, Holton, Joly, Jones (Halifax), Jones, [Leeds and Grenville], Killam, Little, Macdonald, (Glengarry), Mackenzie, Magill, McCallum, McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Renfrew), McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pickard, Pozer, Redford, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Shanly, Smith [Westmoreland], Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Haldimand), Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, Whitehead, Wood, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—62.

NAYS.—Messrs. Abbott, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Beaubien, Belerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brousseau, Cameron [Inverness], Campbell, Carling, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Chipman, Cimon, Coffin, Costigan, Currier, Daoust, Delorme [Provencher], Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Hineks [Sir Francis], Howe, Hurdon, Irvine, Jackson, Keeler, Kirkpatrick, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson [Soulanges], Masson, [Terrebonne], McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), Munroe, O'Connor, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ryan (Montreal West), Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Sylvain, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White

[East Hastings], Willson, Workman, and Wright (Ottawa County).—88.

It being 6 o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

Dr. GRANT asked leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Canada Pacific Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said under the Standing Orders it was too late to introduce a Private Bill. As there could be no possibility of carrying it through this session it would be better to drop it.

After some discussion the Bill was dropped.

PRIVATE AND LOCAL BILLS.

The following Private and Local Bills were read a second and third time and passed:—

An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick (as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.) Hon. Mr. TILLEY.

An Act to extend to the Province of New Brunswick the operation of the Act of the Legislature of the late Province of Canada concerning the Synod of the Church of England in Canada (from Senate) (Reported).—Hon. Mr. TILLEY.

An Act to incorporate the Mutual Life Association of Canada (from Senate) (Reported).—Hon. Mr. McDougall (Lanark).

An Act to incorporate the Kingston Board of Trade (Reported).—Mr. Kirkpatrick.

An Act to incorporate the Board of Trade of the Town of Windsor (Ontario) (Reported).—Mr. O'Connor.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Improvement and Management of the Harbor of Quebec (Reported).—Hon. Mr. Langevin.

An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company (as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines).—Mr. Simpson.

THE MEMBER FOR LISGAR.

Dr. SCHULTZ was introduced by Hon. Mr. TILLEY and Mr. O'CONNOR, and took his seat on the Opposition side amid applause.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the House into Committee on the Act relating to Banks and Banking.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT in the chair.

The Bill was reported from Committee, read a third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED.

The following Bills were read a second and third time and passed:—

An Act respecting the Loan for the purpose of paying a certain sum to the Hudson's Bay Company, and to make other provisions with respect to such loan.—Hon. Sir Francis Hincks.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the settlement of the Affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada.—Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels.—Hon. Dr. Tupper.

SUPPLY.

Hon. Sir. F. HINCKS moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE wished for explanations respecting the Militia estimates. In the present state of the country some anxiety was felt respecting its militia force. It was too large for maintaining police regulations, and too small for purposes of war. With respect to the recommendations of the Adjutant-General in particular, explanations would be desirable.

Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said there were various recommendations and he would ask the Hon. Member for Lambton to say on which particular points he desired information.

Mr. MACKENZIE instanced the change in the staff, the Military Schools and other matters in which changes were introduced.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER, would do his best to satisfy the hon. member. The principal features in the changes were as to the organization of the staff. The Adjutant General recommended a new system in this respect which had his hearty approval. It was that staff appointments should only last for five years. This did not require legislation, but could be carried out by general orders, sanctioned by his Excellency. The Adjutant General also recommended an expenditure to induce the Militia to undergo 15 days drill under canvas. This was adopted in the estimates. With regard to the Military School the report of the Adjutant General showed what had been done. The British Troops having been almost entirely withdrawn, it was necessary to have schools of military instruction for Cadets, to enable them to qualify as officers. It was therefore recommended that these schools should be carried on at Toronto, Kingston and Montreal under the superintendence of Militia officers and to prevent abuse the

number of pupils was to be limited to 550, so as to prevent any one passing the schools merely to obtain the \$50. These Schools would be open only from November to June. With regard to the rank of officers called to command the Districts and the officers at head quarters, For instance a District officer by the law could not rank higher than Lt. Colonel, and he might chance to have a senior officer under his command. It was therefore proposed that the D. A. G's should rank as Colonel and the Adjutant General ranking in time of peace as Colonel, but in time of war as high as Major General. This would require to be done by legislation.

Mr. MACKENZIE referred to the proposal to fill up the ranks by ballot.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the law already provided that the Militia should be formed either of volunteers, or failing that by ballot. The Government did not propose however to resort to that now, as the active Militia already numbered 4000 more than were required by law—which had arisen from the zeal to fill up the ranks. If, however, the ranks at any time could not be filled by volunteers, the Ballot would have to be resorted to, as directed by law.

Mr. MACKENZIE mentioned the naval estimates.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the Government did not propose to enter any expenditure to provide for the naval defence of the country which had to be supplied by the Imperial Government. The Dominion Government had merely to provide Water Police, and they did not intend to do the duty of the Imperial Government.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked for information, as to the provision of some small permanent force for the protection of arsenals, perhaps in distant parts of the Dominion, consequent on the removal of the British troops. It was not likely that any military force would be required to maintain the peace, but he thought it might be necessary at some time for the Government to have a small force at their disposal.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the Government did not intend to have any permanent force as the British Troops had been withdrawn, they did not think it advisable to organize a permanent force, as the maintenance of three such Regiments would cost as much as the whole Militia under the present system. The training of the Militia would give quite sufficient power, and there was an appropriation for the maintenance of two Garrison Batteries of 100 men each. Half a Battery would be stationed at Toronto, a full Battery at Kingston, and half a Battery on St.

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

Helens Island, Montreal. That Island would maintain all military stores which must be protected. This would not however be a permanent service but would be open to the whole Militia in rotation. The system would of course be open to improvement, as experience might require. With respect to Manitoba and British Columbia, they would be distinct military Districts.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) was glad there was going to be no permanent force, but it was perfectly useless to keep up artillery and similar branches of the military organization on the volunteer system. Garrison artillery were good, but field batteries were much more necessary, and both branches should be permanent, or at all events steps should be taken to render the army efficient, which certainly could not be done, if the men had only 8 days drill. As to the ballot it was impossible to have a volunteer corps containing a number of ballotted men. He asked what was the total amount of stores and arms available for the defence of the country in place of need. He was most anxious that the men should be thoroughly and efficiently equipped.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the active militia were all armed with the Snider rifle to the number of about 42,000. They had 6,000 others in reserve, and he should ask an appropriation for an additional supply. They had purchased from the Imperial Government stores to the value of £170,000 sterling, which had to be paid in three years. The usual amount was asked for the maintenance of the militia, and, in case of emergency, they would have a sufficient accumulation of stores to last until further supplies could be obtained. Any bodies of men who would remain in camp for 15 days would obtain their \$8 and their rations also. The time for the annual drill was fixed according to the report of the Deputy Adjutant Generals. The Government allowed a certain amount of assistance to officers who went to an expense to provide a band.

Mr. BROWN understood it was optional whether 8 days or 16 days drill should be undertaken.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—The Government did not intend to enforce 15 days' drill in camp against the wishes of the men, but there was no doubt that if the option was given the majority would go through the 15 days drill.

Mr. BOWELL thought the system would prove a failure, as where an optional order was received it was seldom received pleasantly, whereas, if there were a definite order, there would be no difficulty.

Mr. MACKENZIE approved of the de-

cision that there should be no standing army. As to the staff appointments lasting for five years, he thought it could not be carried out. Officers would not remove from their homes to discharge the duties of Brigade Major or Deputy Adjutant General, and the consequence would be, that the positions would be filled by inexperienced and inefficient persons. He thought the duties of Brigade Major and Deputy Adjutant General could well be discharged by one officer. He thought the optional system of camping would involve the breaking up of the brigade camps altogether, as some would agree and some would dissent, and there should be no order other than definite precise orders. He thought that brigade camps were far more valuable than battalion camps for purposes of efficient drill. He regretted the militia estimates, the most important of all estimates, had been left to so late a period of the session.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER believed the hon. member for Lambton gave the utmost consideration to this subject, but he thought the House should not be repeatedly told that England had entirely withdrawn her troops. Though he regretted the policy of concentration that had been adopted by England, it must not be forgotten what she was doing at Halifax, and the troops left at Quebec, so that the system had not been carried out in entirety in respect to Canada. He reminded the hon. member for Lambton of his expressions on a previous occasion in recognizing the zeal of the Adjutant General, and the great efficiency of the Militia Department, in the occurrences of the past summer. Of course they had not a War Department, but he believed the militia system was fully equal to any emergency that was likely to arise.

Mr. MACKENZIE was quite ready to say that it was not possible for any gentleman to conduct the militia affairs better than the present Adjutant General, but he had a right to call attention to anything of which he did not approve. He considered the militia enrollment two years ago a complete farce which had in no way increased the efficiency. There must be in some way an efficient service, but he was not disposed to support any crotchets.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET said the 5 years appointments to the staff applied to the paid officers only, and it was absolutely necessary that those officers should be efficient. The country did not require a standing army, but there must be a sufficient training to secure efficiency. He did not believe the Imperial Government would abandon Canada in any degree, but merely concentrated their troops for Imperial

purposes. He hoped the member for Lambton would afford the Minister of Militia every assistance, and consider the estimates fairly.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said the expenditure must be fairly considered, but efficiency must be secured, though no standing army was required. There must be a volunteer force to form a nucleus to fall back on in time of need, and that nucleus was now to be considered. The artillery branch deserved special consideration, as its importance was fully shown by the recent events in Europe. He would ask, therefore, whether the number of batteries would be increased? As to the question of camps, he believed that unless the matter was made compulsory it would be a failure. He thought 16 days' drill was too great an increase at once, and that the ordinary drill should be increased gradually; and it was too much to ask a man to take half a dollar a day when at drill when he might earn a dollar and a half at home.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON suggested that the House should go into Committee, and on the motion of Sir George E. Cartier, the House went into Committee, Mr. Stephen in the chair:—

Mr. JOLY asked about Isle aux Nois whether it should not be occupied or completely dismantled.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said with regard to the 15 days drill, the Government had thought of the objection to the optional drill. The estimates were only for, such Battalions as should be found willing to take the 15 days drill and then the order to those Battalions, would be definite and compulsory. He maintained that the Canadian Militia system was the best system in the world, and he read a letter he had previously referred to from Mr. Reade the Registrar of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee, and Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, expressing the highest opinion of the Canadian system—as to the enrolment which the member for Lambton had termed useless. If France had had that system she might have been saved. It furnished a reserve from which might be drawn any number of men in time of need and the expenditure was as nothing compared with the advantage. The rule of the 5 years Service would apply only to the paid staff, and would introduce new blood, and encourage officers throughout the country who took great interest in these matters. After the 5 years, however, any officer was competent for reappointment. The Government could not establish a military academy at present. With respect to the Artillery, the Government being thoroughly impressed with the importance of the

Branch had secured the service of Colonel French who would give his attention to the Artillery organization throughout the country. With regard to Isle aux Nois the Government did not intend to occupy it as a place of defence, and the whole armament had been transferred to St. Helens Island, Montreal.

Mr. MASSON [Terrebonne], asked what amount had been paid for the armaments of the Forts handed over?

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said a very small amount had been paid, nearly the value of the metal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK asked under what Department the military works would be put?

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the property would be taken care of by Cols. French and Wily, assisted by local officers.

On the item of \$55,440 for salaries of military branch and district staff, and \$30,000 for salaries of Brigade Majors, including three Brigade Majors for Manitoba and British Columbia,

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER explained that it was absolutely necessary to appoint officers for Manitoba and British Columbia.

After some conversation the items were carried.

Mr. SPROAT supported the proposed changes in the system.

The following items were then carried. \$47,000 for allowances for drill instruction; \$65,000 for military schools; \$130,109 for ammunition; and \$130,000 for clothing.

On the Item of \$85,683 for Military stores and storage, Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) spoke of the bad accommodation given for storage to the rural Battalions, who were very much neglected.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said if a memorandum were left of the complaint, the matter should receive attention.

Item of \$60,000 for public armories carried.

On the item of \$500,000 for drill pay and camp purposes, Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) thought 12 days drill was enough and should be made general and compulsory, by order from head quarters.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the Government was providing for 16 days drill in camp, and those who agreed to this would receive \$8 and rations.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK thought the drill should be 12 days.

Item carried.

On the Item \$75,000 for contingencies and general service—not otherwise provided for,

Hon. Mr. Blanchet.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) asked what would be the prizes for the Battalions and the Rifle Associations?

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the system would be the same this year as last, so as to encourage practice among the battalions. After this year the money for the Dominion Rifle Association would cease, but three Provinces had already had the benefit of it, and Nova Scotia still remained; after that the amount would be given to the battalions.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the amount to the Rifle Association, and said the House had been promised last year that the vote would not be asked again.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) thought Nova Scotia should certainly have the benefit of the amount, as the other Provinces had enjoyed it.

Mr. CHIPMAN said Nova Scotia had a right to the money—it was no favor and the original arrangement should be carried out.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the real question was the utility of the Dominion matches, and he doubted that utility very much. As, however, there had been three matches, there should be another for Nova Scotia, but thought this should be the last time the vote should be asked.

Mr. MACKENZIE had no knowledge whatever of any arrangement that each Province should have its turn.

After some further conversation the item passed.

The following items then passed:—

\$5,000 for targets, and \$20,000 for drill sheds and rifle ranges; \$12,000 for barrack accommodation; \$2,607 for Military Survey; \$5,000 to meet expense of damages to arms; \$25,000 for gunboats; \$12,500 for care and maintenance of properties transferred from the Ordnance; \$142,055 for improved fire arms; \$33,606 for Ordnance and equipment of artillery; and \$75,000 for pay, maintenance, and equipment of two batteries of garrison artillery.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he had not criticised the individual items, but thought the whole scale objectionable.

The Committee then rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. CHIPMAN asked why the Militia General Order of 24th February last does not include a return of the best and second best shots for 1870 in Nova Scotia, and whether any return thereof has been made by the Deputy Adjutant General for that district?

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER read the answer as follows: "A return of the best and second best shots was received from

Deputy Adjutant General commanding Military District No. 9, Nova Scotia, which was incomplete, and has been returned to Nova Scotia for further information, but no answer has, as yet, been received.

The House adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, 6th April, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After routine,

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—Vaudreuil Railway Bill, To incorporate the Bedford District Bank, Western Bank, Metropolitan Bank; Act to combine the financial affairs of the Great Western Railway; to incorporate the Bank of Liverpool; to incorporate the Sun Insurance Company of Montreal.

An Act to amend the Act on Duties and Customs was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN moved that the Isolated Risk Insurance Company Bill be referred back to Committee for amendment.—Lost on division.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN moved that the time for receiving reports on Private Bills be extended to 11th April.—Carried.

The following Bills from the Commons, were read a first time:—

Act concerning Payment of Money to the Hudson's Bay Company.

Act for Settlement of the Affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada.

Act concerning Fishing by Foreign Vessels.

Act relating to the Harbour of Quebec.

In answer to enquiries by Hon. Mr. Hazen,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the survey of the Bay Verte Canal was in charge of Mr. Baillargé, and would probably be finished in a month. It cost up to the present time \$9,115. There was no estimate of the cost when concluded.

In answer to Hon. Mr. Bourinot,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said the reports of the Engineers at False Bay Beach would be laid before Parliament before prorogation.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated the Bill for the regulation of the Library would be submitted in a few days.

In answer to Hon. Mr. Sanborn,

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated the session would likely be closed on Wednesday next.

The House adjourned till Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 6th, 1871.

After Routine,

Mr. KEELER asked when will the light-houses of Lake Ontario be lighted for the purposes of navigation for the present season.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said, in consequence of the prospect of an early opening of navigation, instructions had already been issued for the purpose.

Mr. POPE moved an address for a return of municipalities entitled to indemnity under the Seigniorial Act, according to the census of 1861.

Carried.

Mr. SAVARY moved for correspondence respecting the duty or liability of the Dominion or Local Governments to defray the cost of criminal prosecutions.

Carried after a short discussion.

THE NORTH WEST TERRITORY.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL moved the House into Committee of the whole to consider the following resolutions :

1. That it appears from an Order in Council and Memorandum of the 1st of March, 1871, transmitted by His Excellency the Governor General for the information of this House that the system approved by an Order in Council of the 23rd September, 1869, for the survey and subdivision of Townships in the North West Territory, has been materially altered to the disadvantage of intending settlers.

2. That the area of Townships has been reduced from eight miles square, to six miles square, and each quarter section or lot from two hundred acres to one hundred and sixty acres.

3. That the allowance for roads which under the former system was added to, and included in the section, thereby leaving the location and direction of roads to the judgment of future settlers [as under the American system] has been limited to one chain in width, and ordered "to be set out and allowed between all townships and sections" without any reference to their utility or convenience.

4. That the proposed distribution of the 1,400,000 acres appropriated by Act of Parliament "towards the extinguishment of the Indian Title to the lands in the Province" of Manitoba among all the half-breed residents instead of limiting the said grant to and dividing it "among the children of the half breed heads of "families residing in the Province at the time of the transfer to Canada" is a violation of the express conditions of the appropriation and contrary to law.

Mr. Keeler.

5. That the restriction of the right of pre-emption to "surveyed" and unappropriated public lands in Manitoba, while this right is secured by Act of Congress to settlers in the unsurveyed as well as the surveyed lands of the United States will tend to discourage settlement in that Province, especially in view of its small area, its large reserves, its northerly climate, and its distance from the market of the world.

6. That the exclusion of Foreigners from the rights of "pre-emption" and "homestead" in Manitoba, while they are freely admitted to these rights in the States and Territories of the American Republic, is practically to exclude them from the Province, and to contradict and annul the policy approved by the House in voting money to maintain emigration agents in foreign countries.

7. That while the best lands of the Crown in Ontario are offered to settlers at 70 cents per acre, and in Quebec at prices ranging from 60 to 20 cents per acre, the regulation which fixes the minimum price of public lands in the distant Province of Manitoba at one dollar per acre, will discourage emigration to that Province, discriminating, as it does, in favour of the older Provinces, and is in direct opposition to the policy of "free grants" and "cheap lands for settlement," which the people of this Dominion, through their Local Legislatures, have recently and distinctly affirmed.

8. That the assumption of authority by the Executive Government to prescribe oaths to settlers to authorize its agents to administer such oaths, and to declare guilty of perjury all persons who may falsely swear them, is illegal and unconstitutional, inasmuch as the right to prescribe oaths, inflict penalties or extend the criminal law, belongs exclusively to Parliament.

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying to provide for the issue of amended regulations for the survey, distribution, settlement and sale of lands in Manitoba, pursuant to the foregoing Resolutions.

He said that the existing regulations were such as to interfere with the settlement of the North West. Whether through ignorance or through a set purpose, it would seem as if this were the very object had in view. There was in the United States a pre-emption right by which it was provided that a settler had the first right to purchasing the land which he occupied at a minimum price. This privilege is now secured to squatters in the unsurveyed parts of the North West, but the language conveyed the impression that none but

subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization were entitled to it. He thought if it were a sound policy to invite foreigners to settle amongst us, they should be entitled to do so on the same footing as our own citizens. He did not wish to occupy the time of the House, but he would like to refer to an order in Council, by which a system or scheme of survey had been agreed upon. Under that system, the lots and townships were too small in extent. The farms consisted of 160 acres of land, and the townships were only six miles square. It would present difficulties in municipal government, and would interfere with the settlement of the Province, the farms being too small. Another matter he objected to, was laying out the future roads on the map. In the United States experience had proved that it was better to leave it to the settlers to decide where roads should be run. The experience of Ontario was against the system of rectangular roads. Government had assumed the right to take the 1,400,000 acres and distribute it in their own way, among another class, to that intended. It was the desire to resist the assumption of power which induced him to draw attention to the matter. Considering that in Ontario the public lands were offered at 70 cents per acre it was preposterous to ask \$1 per acre for land 1,000 miles further west, and whatever hon. gentlemen might say the people would not believe that they desired to see that country thickly settled while they charged so much for the land. Ontario offered very possible inducements to induce settlers by way of easy payment, while in Manitoba lands could not be obtained under \$1 per acre cash. With regard to the administration of oaths, the executive Government had no power to administer oaths, which could only be obtained by Legislative enactment, and the course taken by the Government in this respect was not correct. He hoped the Government would at all events amend the resolutions in three respects; first, to secure the pre-emptive right of all settlers whether upon surveyed or unsurveyed lands; second, that both pre-emptive and homestead rights would be made free and accessible both to subjects and foreigners; and third, that the price of the public lands should be considerably reduced.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS was unable to concur in the view taken in the second and third resolutions, and thought the change in the size of the lots would be very beneficial. The country lay alongside a territory in which the same system was adopted, and there was no doubt that 160 acres of good prairie land were fully equal to

200 acres of the ordinary land in Ontario. The system being the same as that adopted in Minnesota and Dacotah, was well known to the class of emigrants that was to be attracted, and this was a strong argument in favour of its adoption in Manitoba. The honourable member for Lanark had objected to the allowances for roads, but the plan had worked most admirably in Quebec and Ontario, and though it was not in force in the United States, many of the American surveyors had expressed their approval of it, and the Government thought they could not do better than adopt a system which had proved so acceptable. As to the allotment of the land among the half-breeds, the hon. member had objected to the interpretation put upon the Act in that respect by the Order in Council, but the terms of the Act fully justified the Order in Council, and it was certainly desirable that the term "children of the half-breeds" should include all children whether of mature age or not. As to the exclusion of foreigners from the right of pre-emption and homestead, he believed the member for Lanark was to some extent correct in his views, but not entirely. The Government were willing to go as far as the States in this matter. In Canada an alien required to reside a certain period in the country, and to comply with the naturalization laws; in the States an alien could settle upon a lot of land, but his patent would not issue until after a period of three years. While, therefore, he believed every encouragement and facility should be afforded to settlers, it was necessary to retain some such safeguard as the Americans provided, and only a patent when the settler should have determined to assume all the rights and obligations of a British subject, and on the payment of a small fee necessary to cover the expense of survey. If, however, the settler desired to obtain a title to his land at once he could do so by paying \$1 an acre. The American lands cost \$1.25 an acre, and the Government had fixed the price in order to offer every encouragement for settlers, and taking care at the same time that the lands should not be undervalued. The House was unanimously agreed that these lands were valuable, and he considered it would be anything but true wisdom to undervalue these lands. It was no hardship to ask a man to wait three years for his title, when at the end of that time he received a practically free grant. The member for Lanark had objected that the regulations at present did not admit of entrance on unsurveyed lands. The original Act of Congress, after which the Canadian Act was framed, expressly provided that there should be no settlement on unsurveyed

lands, or on lands with respect to which the Indian title should not be extinct. There was an Indian title in Manitoba, and the matter had to be approached with the utmost delicacy, and with a view to secure a firm and binding union with the warlike tribes of Indians in that country, unless they wished a repetition of the scenes which had taken place in some of the Western States of America. The Government had every desire to complete the survey, but they had to proceed very carefully for this reason, so that settlers might take possession of the lands without any fear of interference or danger. The member for Lanark had charged that the regulations seemed to be framed purposely to prevent settlement, but he could point to every action of the Government, their treatment of the volunteers, their desire to open a line of water communication, and every thing they had done to show that their earnest desire was to encourage emigration to the utmost extent possible. The objection that had been taken in the matter of the administration of oaths could be very easily remedied.

Mr. BOWELL desired to call attention to the regulations respecting volunteers. Only those of the two battalions settling under the homestead rights, were entitled to the 160 acres grant. Those volunteers who had been discharged, and those who did not become actual settlers were not entitled to the grant. He was sure this was not the object of the Government.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL took this as a favorable indication that the Government would so amend the Act as to include all the volunteers who had been connected with the Red River expedition.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER assured his hon. friend that it was the intention of the Government to deal in the most liberal manner with all the volunteers, even extending to those at St. Helen's Island who had shown a disposition to go to Red River with the expedition. The only ones who would not be entitled to free grants were those who had been discharged for misconduct, and he was happy to say there were very few such cases. Free grants would be given without conditions of settlement to all others, and this would not deprive them of the right of securing an additional lot in the same manner as other settlers. The price of \$1 per acre was put on the land in order to prevent mere speculators from getting hold of the lands. These regulations had been adopted after mature consideration of the American system, and would be well suited for the speedy settlement of the Province. Actual settlers received free grants, and it was

only actual settlers that the Government wished to encourage in taking up lands. They desired to exclude land companies from monopolizing large tracts. It was the British North American land company which had impeded the settlement of the Eastern Townships and the Government wished to guard against a repetition of such speculations in the future, so far as the North West was concerned. He was glad the hon. member for Lanark had brought this matter before the House in no party spirit, but with the object of amending regulations which had been framed in haste and in which some clerical errors, he observed had been made.

Dr. SCHULTZ said he feared he might be considered presumptuous in addressing the House so late in the session, yet, he was encouraged to do so by the information that this matter had been delayed somewhat, awaiting the arrival of the Manitoba members. In giving his views upon it, he would simply refer to the principle adopted as shown by the Orders in Council. And first, he would refer to the order relating to the system of surveys. He stated decidedly and confidently that in his belief, and in the belief of the people he represented, the plan of survey of the Province of Manitoba was superior to that of the Province of Ontario (hear, hear). There could be no reasonable doubt that the Americans had adopted the true principle in the matter of survey, and that it was the best adopted to a prairie country. There was no doubt, too, that it would be found as advantageous on the north side of the boundary line, as it had been proved to be on the south of it. Had the Province of Manitoba been as large as he had hoped it would have been, he would have been of opinion that townships eight miles square with two hundred acre lots would have been better than six miles square townships, with 160 acre lots. But, remembering that the Province was small, and that one-twentieth of the lands were set apart for the Hudson's Bay Company, it was better that the lots should be small (hear). The regulation reserving woodlands, and permitting settlers on prairie lands to purchase 40 acres each of this woodland reserve, was an excellent provision. With respect to road allowances, he had very little practical experience, but he would give the experience of the settlers in the Western States. Before a country was settled and before lands became valuable it made very little difference where the roads ran, but in a well-settled country, it was a different matter. In conversation with a very intelligent settler in Minnesota, he had been assured that this regulation had become a very objectionable feature indeed in the more settled parts of

Hon. Mr. Morris.

the State. It was all very well for the public to run the road in the most direct line, but it was not so pleasant to the man through whose land the road ran. He gave an instance of where a Democrat who lived in a Republican neighbourhood had a road run through his lot, not because it was necessary to locate it there, but because he differed in politics from his neighbors (laughter). If he were allowed to make a suggestion, he would recommend the Government to increase the road allowance from one chain to one and a half in width. Few in this House, perhaps, had any practical experience of prairie countries, and he could assure them that it made a very great difference whether these roads were broad or not in Manitoba. Existing roads were two chains wide, and in Minnesota they varied from 80 to 100 feet in width. In prairie countries, the surface of the prairie, untouched by the plough and shovel, made the best roads—it was impossible to construct a better. The matted roots of the grass of centuries had made a turf that lacked, indeed, the firmness of a macadamized road, but had while it lasted a springiness which served far better. After cutting through one track with wagon wheels, a new track could be chosen. In winter, too, when the fences were too close together, the road became drifted, so that, until late in the spring, after the melting of the last of the snow, they were rendered impassable. If Government would consent to make the breadth of the road one and a half, instead of one chain in breadth, it would please the people he represented, and, he believed, the whole of Manitoba. With respect to the grant of 1,400,000 acres to the half-breeds he was instructed by his constituents to thank the Government. He might explain that the people in his constituency were almost entirely of mixed race. He was also instructed by them to say that they did not believe the stories against the volunteers, and that they were anxious to have them remain and settle in the Province (cheers). He might say, in addition for his constituents, that they had some hesitation in accepting this grant of 1,400,000 acres. They feared that it would bring them into collision with the Indians, the lands being for the extinction of the Indian title. They said, that unless the Indian claim was disposed of there was no chance of the grant being of any practical use to them, the Indians must be satisfied in the matter, and he was anxious to have some satisfactory assurance on this point. He hoped it would be given before the discussion closed. With respect to the distribution of lands, he believed the Government regulation would please the people of Manitoba. He might mention, with respect to

the census, that the belief in Red River settlement was that the census lately taken there, was somewhat incorrect. They did not say it was wilfully done (hear), but from the hasty manner in which it had been done and from the fact that it was taken for a special purpose, there were very grave inaccuracies in it, and he would be very glad to be assured that the census now about to be taken throughout the Dominion would be extended to Manitoba as well, (hear, hear). He referred to the settlement of the Crown Lands, and expressed his gratification at the assurance of the Government that precautions would be taken against permitting speculators to buy up land in Manitoba. He mentioned as an instance of the evils of permitting such men to get hold of large tracts of country, a place in Minnesota, where on one side of the road there was a prosperous settlement, while the other side of it was yet a wilderness through being in the hands of what a resident in the neighborhood called "the cursed speculators." (A laugh). He hoped the Government would take every necessary precaution to prevent the lands in the North West from falling into the hands of the "cursed speculators." He hoped there would be no grounds for further objections respecting settlers from foreign countries. Manitoba should be placed in a position to compete with the Western States in securing emigration from Europe, and all settlers should be allowed equal privileges in the North West. If his suggestion on this point and his recommendation respecting road allowances were adopted, he would be perfectly satisfied with the Government resolutions. It seemed to him that the reservation of the woodlands was a most important and much needed provision—a provision which, if the inhabitants of Manitoba had not got, would have given rise to very grave difficulties in future. Immediately after the survey of the lands, those lands might be taken up if the Government had not adopted this method, thus greatly embarrassing settlers coming afterwards. The departure from the American system in this matter was, he believed, a wise one. He hoped that settlement in the North West, for a time, would be confined to Manitoba, and that no encouragement should be given to settle out-side of it. There was no doubt that the Indians were, if not in an excited state, at least in a very uneasy state, not that they feared that the Government would deal unfairly with them, but they were anxious to know what policy would be adopted towards them. He would be very much pleased if the Government should give some outline of what that policy was to be (cheers.)

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was the determination of the Government, as soon as the House should be prorogued, to send a commissioner who was acquainted with the Indian character to Manitoba at once, and make such a treaty with the Indians who might be interested in the lands in Manitoba, that full security would be given to anyone who would obtain under these regulations any lot in the Province (hear, hear), and not only that, but the Government policy was to settle as much as they could with the Indians outside of Manitoba in the North West (hear). For instance, in order that the fair region bordering on each side of the Saskatchewan should be settled as soon as possible, they would take care that the settlers should be secured against being disturbed in the enjoyment of their property. With respect to the road allowances, the Government would give full consideration to the suggestion of the hon. member for Lisgar (hear, hear).

Dr. SCHULTZ expressed his gratification at the explanations of the Hon. Minister of Militia and especially those relating to the volunteers [hear hear]. He certainly thought that the liberality with which the Government had treated the volunteers had been perfectly deserved by them [cheers], certainly if any class of men deserved the most favourable treatment at the hands of the Government, and to be recognized by the country, it was the volunteers who went to the Red River settlement. He was pleased that the concession had been made and the explanation offered [hear, hear].

Mr. OLIVER objected to the clause permitting half breeds to take up lands at eighteen years of age, while whites were not permitted to do so before attaining their majority. He believed that no distinction should be made between the different races.

The House rose for recess at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS.

On the

ELECTION BILL.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said since the previous discussion some amendments had been suggested with regard to the list of electors, a difficulty having arisen in consequence of a duplicate list not being really a certified copy of a list. He was therefore prepared to introduce an amendment as follows: Any copy of the voters list certified as being a true copy thereof by the Clerk, Treasurer or Secretary-Treasurer having made or having the custody of the original, shall be held to be a duplicate of such voter's list for all the purposes of this Act, as respects the

election of members to serve in the House of Commons. To meet other objections he would also propose the following amendments: Any Registrar who shall deliver to a Deputy Returning Officer any list of voters which shall not be conformable to the duplicate or certified copy of a voters list deposited in the office of such Registrar at least one month before the date of the writ of election, shall incur a penalty of \$400 for each copy so delivered. Any Clerk, Treasurer, or Secretary-Treasurer who shall deliver to any Registrar any list of voters' which shall not be conformable to that remaining in record in the office of such Clerk, Treasurer or Secretary-Treasurer, shall for each list so delivered incur a penalty of \$400. The penalty hereby imposed shall be recoverable and appropriated in the manner provided by the 6th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of the late Province of Canada with respect of penalties of like amount enforced by that chapter. The foregoing provisions of this section shall apply only to elections for the House of Commons of Canada, and to voters lists to be used at such elections. With regard to Nova Scotia, the laws prevailing of the 1st July, 1867, would be reverted to, and the ballot which had since been introduced would be discontinued.

Hon. Mr. DORION said that he agreed with the amendments proposed to a very great extent. He thought it unnecessary, however, that two Justices of the Peace should recognise the lists to make them legal, and he thought one Justice enough.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he would introduce an amendment to that effect.

Hon. Mr. DORION was perfectly satisfied with this, but regretted this Bill should be brought up now, instead of bringing up a complete Bill on settled principles when there was plenty of time for discussion. He did not think there was any necessity for the amendment inflicting a penalty for a falsified list as the law already made it a misdemeanor.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that considering the previous amendment this provision was necessary.

Hon. Mr. DORION did not object to it, but thought it unnecessary.

Mr. CAMPBELL thought the principle being ceded, the House should go at once into Committee and consider the amendments. On the suggestion of Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier, he would explain the amendment he was going to propose. At the time of the Union, a revised list was prepared in Nova

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

Scotia, and after scrutiny a complete register was formed on which the elections were held. He proposed to give the franchise to every one enjoying it at the time of the Union, irrespective of subsequent legislation of the Local Government. Although there might not be a general election before another Session, vacancies might occur, and it was therefore necessary that a proper law should exist. To accomplish his object, he proposed to appoint a Commissioner for each district in Nova Scotia, to make their voters lists exactly what they would have been under the laws in force at the Union. He did not of course propose to interfere with the Local elections, but the Local Legislature had interfered with the elections for the Dominion Government, and he proposed to correct this. The parties that had been excluded were all those having the "smell of Canada."

Mr. JONES (Halifax), thought the Bill dealt with the electors of Nova Scotia most unfairly. It took from the people of that Province that control over their own affairs, which the other Provinces enjoyed. The ballot system had become the law of the land, and while the Bill ceded it to New Brunswick, it refused it to Nova Scotia. In Quebec and Ontario, no employees of the Dominion Government enjoyed the franchise, and the same law existed in Nova Scotia, but was now to be taken away. He only asked that Nova Scotia should be placed in exactly the same position as the other Provinces. It was necessary that Nova Scotia should be protected from the influence and coercion of the heads of the departments at Ottawa, by disfranchising the employees of the Dominion Government altogether. He referred to the Inspection Law, as an instance of class legislation as while in every other city in the Dominion having a Board of Trade, the examiners were appointed by that Board, in Halifax they were appointed by the Governor in Council. Nova Scotia proposed to disfranchise every one drawing their annual salary from the Dominion, but not those who were employed temporarily or drawing only a small amount. The Bill was partial and unfair, and he was ashamed that any member from Nova Scotia should acquiesce in it. He objected to the amendment of the member for Guysboro', as placing the whole power in the hands of one Commissioner. For instance, if a Commissioner had to be appointed for Guysboro', no doubt the member for that county would have an extreme partizan appointed, and there would be no check on him. The law ought to be general and the same throughout the Dominion; and he wanted to know whether the

people of Nova Scotia were not to have the protection of their own laws.

Mr. YOUNG said he was sorry the Government was not prepared to provide that the elections should take place on one and the same day throughout the country, as their was no doubt that such a provision would do away to a great extent with outside interference, and would prove a great benefit, and he should move an amendment to this effect.

Hon. Mr. HOWE regretted very deeply that the member for Halifax should bring up day after day, topics which were only calculated to create irritation, without doing good. He complained that Nova Scotia was not to have the ballot. Did he not know that only last Session, the Local Legislature adopted the ballot, and this Session they had repealed it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax)—No they have not.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the ballot was adopted a year ago, this year every member of the Government in the House of Assembly voted for its repeal, but the other House refused to accede.

Hon Mr. HOWE said at all events the Bill had passed the popular branch by a majority. He desired to call the attention of the House to the following contrast: When he stood at the head of the party in Nova Scotia, they fought the whole Dominion, and won the elections, though every man connected with the Dominion was against them, and now the hon. member for Halifax came up whinnying for the disfranchisement of Dominion officials. The hon. member had got in for his (Mr. Howe's) old county, into which he would not have set his foot without his (Mr. Howe's) influence by a majority of nearly 400, but recently Mr. Garvie, supported by Mr. Jones, ran the same county, and was left in a minority of fifteen. What had done this? Why it was the wholesale abuse of him (Mr. Howe) behind his back. Of all the poor spectacles he had ever seen presented by any public man, he had never seen the equal of that presented by the hon. member for Halifax. He desired to disfranchise those who might have spent all their lives in their country's service, but who might vote against him and his precious party at the next election. The hon. member must remember that in this House he met a body of gentlemen, who knew how to speak and act on wider views than those by which his conduct was governed.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the same rule should hold in every section of the Dominion. The question was not whether the Nova Scotia Government had acted from good or bad motives, but whether

their act was consistent with the general law or not. In Ontario and Quebec certain officers of the Government were disfranchised and no good excuse could be urged for enfranchising men holding similar offices in the Lower Provinces. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Antigonish embodied a most dangerous principle. It gave the Government power to appoint Commissioners who might prepare voters lists and strike from it whoever they pleased. He (Mr. Mackenzie) approved of the motion of the hon. member for Halifax. It provided that the same machinery by which the local elections were managed should be employed in the Dominion elections. He could not give his assent to the appointment of Commissioners by the Government. Such officers could hardly be expected to be impartial in making out the voters lists.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER was certain that the hon. member for Lambton had not appreciated the amendment of the honourable member for Guysboro'. In 1867, the anti-unionists in Nova Scotia carried the elections. A complete revolution had taken place in public sentiment since. The object of this amendment was to appoint Commissioners to add to the voters' lists names which had within the last week been struck from them by the Local Legislature. The desire of the Government was to restore the election law to the position in which it stood in 1867.

Mr. MACKENZIE wished to know why these Commissioners were to be appointed in Nova Scotia alone. Why was it not done in Ontario?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said a change had taken place in the basis of the franchise in Ontario. No such change had taken place in Nova Scotia. The same basis remained and all that was desired by this Bill was to add to the list names which had been excluded by recent legislation in the Parliament of Nova Scotia. It was absurd to expect that this House should adopt the election laws of the Local Legislatures, for in Nova Scotia, the ballot was adopted one session and in the following session the new law was repealed. While the Bill recently passed in Nova Scotia disfranchised the Dominion officials, it did not interfere with the employees of the Local Government. It was for this reason that he desired to see the election law in Nova Scotia restored to the condition in which it was in 1867.

Mr. BLAKE said that Dominion officials in Ontario were disfranchised, while employees of the Local Government had the right of voting. Why not treat the two Provinces in the same way? Was it

Mr. Mackenzie.

right with the revelations of the other day to enfranchise Government officials? The franchise meant freedom of choice, but these men had not such freedom. They were under the curse of being obliged to vote at the dictation of their employers, and not in accordance with experience and the dictates of their conscience. They were now asked to decide whether the Government should or should not be allowed to use their horde of officers as tools to prevent the expression of public opinion in Nova Scotia (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the question was a very clear one. The Union Act declared that the elections should take place according to the laws in force in the different Provinces at the time of the Union until the Dominion Parliament chose to alter it. Several attempts had been made to change it, but it had not yet been done. England had outgrown the prejudices which were now urged. Though, two years ago, the Government proposed to disfranchise Government officials, last session, they adopted the opposite principle. There was no analogy between the Legislatures of the States and Congress, and the different Provinces and the Dominion. The States were allowed a much wider field than the Provinces. The Local Legislature had no right to interfere with Dominion matters. The Government accepted the Ontario system, because there was nothing unfair or wrong, but in Nova Scotia, in order to prevent any men having the smell of Canada having any voice, they had declared that no employee of the Dominion Government should vote, but they had not disfranchised their own officials. There were very many more local employees than Dominion employees, and the matter was not only a wrong but an insult. The Local Legislature might do what they liked in their own elections, but why should they interfere in Dominion elections?

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the question was whether or not, it was right that employees of the Dominion Government should vote for members of that House. They could not do so in the greater portion of the Dominion, and why should they be allowed to do so in Nova Scotia. The English law had only allowed employees of the Government in consequence of the enormous extension of the franchise which rendered it unimportant, whether a comparatively small number of employees should vote or not.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the Canadian franchise was pretty nearly as extensive as the English.

Mr. MILLS said there was a great difference between these matters in England and

Canada, as to the position of heads and subordinate officials, so that the Government in England had nothing like the direct influence over their employees that existed in Canada. He had no objection to the Government employees voting if only they had secret voting, but not otherwise—and so long as open voting existed they ought not to vote. This was already the case in Ontario and Quebec, and it ought to be the rule throughout the Dominion.

Hon. Col. GREY said there was no exclusion in New Brunswick, and no difficulty had ever arisen. The principle had recently been adopted in England and it ought to obtain in the whole Dominion. True, they had ballot in New Brunswick, but Ontario and Quebec would not adopt it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax)—Is the ballot good?

Hon. Col. GREY said it was.

Mr. JONES—Why do you not give it to us in Nova Scotia?

Hon. Col. GREY—We have, but you will not keep it. You repealed it a few days ago.

Mr. JONES—No, we did not.

Hon. Col. GREY said Nova Scotia legislators recently voted to repeal it. At any rate they in New Brunswick were content with the present system which they did not wish to see disturbed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish) supported the Government Bill, stating they did not wish to disfranchise anybody in Nova Scotia, but to enfranchise some already disqualified by the Local Legislature. They had improperly disfranchised one set of officials, while leaving their own in possession of voters' rights which required as much protection from them as that of Dominion officials did from Canadian Ministers. He disapproved of any class legislation of this kind, of any restriction of the franchise proposed. He criticized some features of the election laws in the different provinces, finding fault with the provisions of the Ontario Law. He contended there was nothing dangerous in the appointment of Commissioners to put in names wrongfully struck off, and remove others improperly put in by Provincial authorities, so as to leave the lists in the same condition as in 1867. Gentlemen who contended for uniformity in respect of disfranchisement of the Dominion officials in all the Provinces were inconsistent, as they had advocated permission to the different Provinces to arrange the franchise as they pleased, in which case there would be no uniformity at all. He believed he would be doing an

injustice to a large class by supporting the proposal for their disqualification.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said there was very little change proposed with regard to the Province of Ontario, the principal one being the completion of the polling on one day. They had been kept waiting week after week before legislating on this subject just to undo what the people of Nova Scotia had done. He had differed with his conferees around him to the extent of believing a general election law should be brought in. The Government had not done so, but proposed an entirely different principle for Nova Scotia from that authorised for Ontario. The members from Nova Scotia seemed to tremble in their shoes lest the servants, he might say the slaves, of the Dominion Government should be deprived of the right to vote [cheers]. Nothing more conclusively showed the change that had taken place in the sentiments of these gentlemen who had come here determined to defeat the Dominion Government, or struggle to the last for the repeal of the Union, than the zeal now displayed for the enfranchisement of their officials in that Province. He contended that it would be better and fairer to the officials themselves to deprive them of a right which the Canadian Government could secure the abuse of, at discretion. Recent events demonstrated the readiness with which this could be done. He maintained the propriety of a uniform system, disqualifying all Government officials. At present Dominion employees swarmed in certain localities in the Lower Provinces, and their votes would be practically at the command of the Canadian authorities. It would be monstrous to place the power contemplated in the hands of election Commissioners. It would be grossly perverted for party purposes, and the recent vote in this House declaring wrong was right and black was white, showed the kind of redress they might expect at its hands in case of abuses of the sort most probable. This Bill, he believed, would be tantamount to authorizing the Government of Canada to take such steps as it deemed necessary to secure the result of the forthcoming Provincial elections in its favour (Opposition cheers).

Mr. MACDONALD (Lunenburg) said a most important provision of the Bill had been overlooked. Since this Bill had first been introduced, a law had been passed in Nova Scotia changing the election law. Hon. gentlemen in this House were anxious to make the Dominion law conform to that change. It had been asserted that Dominion officials swarmed in Nova Scotia. He denied that statement. In the County

of Halifax there were not more than ten or twelve altogether, and that County might be taken as a fair specimen of every constituency in the Province. If the principle were correct that all Dominion officials ought to be disfranchised in Nova Scotia, let it be applied to all the Provinces. There were three times as many Local as Dominion officials. At the present moment there was a sum of \$400,000 at the command of the Local Government for the purchase of the forthcoming elections. Each constituency was allowed its quota of money for roads, bridges, &c., and each had a number of officials administering these funds and discharging official duties. Let all these employees be excluded, if the principle were to be promulgated at all. The Local Legislature had made such changes and modifications as suited the requirements of the Local Government, apart altogether from any principle. Were we to be dragged at the tail of every Provincial Legislature, to accept every change they chose to adopt? The present Bill but proposed to carry out the law in force in 1867; not to change the basis of the representation, but merely to decide as to the right as to certain names to appear on the electoral lists. While Dominion officials were liable to be influenced by the wishes of Dominion Ministers, he denied that in all cases this was the result, and cited instances to the contrary. If the principle was to be adopted, let it be extended to the Local Government officials, including road Commissioners swarming in all the constituencies, and who, from the temporary character of their appointments, were more likely to be influenced by Provincial Ministers than the Dominion officers in question by the heads of their departments (hear, hear).

Hon. Mr. DORION found fault with the provisions of the Bill changing the number of electors for each polling place from 600 to 200, and transferring from the municipality to the returning officer the power of subdivision in the case of an excess of this number. He urged the confinement of the polling within the limits of the territorial subdivision, so as not to draw voters away from their domiciles.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER defended the points assailed, stating the municipalities in Lower Canada in the past had neglected their duty in this respect. As the polling was reduced to one day, they were obliged to give for it all the facilities possible. He had no objection to putting a small distance between the polling booths, but there was no use in providing for the discharge by municipalities of duties which they would continue to neglect.

Mr. Macdonald.

Hon. Mr. DORION repeated his arguments in favour of leaving the law as it stands, continuing to municipalities the power of making the necessary subdivisions; and he also proposed granting this authority to Returning Officers in case they neglected the duty; and also an arrangement preventing the assembling of more than 200 voters at any place.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON supported the arguments of the previous speaker, and pointed out the liability of the proposals of the Bill to abuse.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER promised to consider these suggestions, and announce his conclusions at a later stage.

Mr. BLAKE urged that the leaving of these matters to the municipality would result in securing the proper central location of the polling places, and the satisfactory creation of the sub-divisions.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER stated his willingness to accept some changes recommended, including some calculated to secure uniformity in the method of paying Returning Officers and greater economy.

Mr. COSTIGAN proposed an amendment providing that where dual representation was not in force, namely, in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, any one holding a seat in the Local Legislature should, before being nominated for a seat in the Commons, produce a certificate of his resignation of his seat in the former.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it could be moved in concurrence.

Hon. Mr. DORION gave notice that he would propose a few amendments; first, Returning Officers in cities and towns should be selected from municipal councillors, and that in countries and ridings it should be either the Warden or Secretary-Treasurer, and in case those parties were disqualified, the Government should appoint whom they might; second, to disqualify all permanent officers of the Government receiving salaries from the Government; third, that contested elections should be tried before the ordinary tribunals of the country as in Ontario.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish) here replied sharply to a few remarks from Mr. Holton reflecting upon his consistency and abilities, stating he had always proved capable of defending himself either outside or inside of the House, and was not afraid of the member for Chateaugay, but was ready to meet him on any occasion.

On motion of Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, the Speaker then left the chair and reported the Bill as amended. Concurrence to be taken on Saturday.

EXTENSION OF THE MILITIA ACT TO MANITOBA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

On motion of Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER, the House went into Committee on the Bill to extend the Militia Act to Manitoba and British Columbia, which was read a third time and passed.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read a second and third time and passed:

An Act to permit of the sale or lease of Rockwood Asylum.

An Act respecting certain officers of the the Trinity House of Quebec.

INLAND REVENUE.

On motion of Hon. Mr. MORRIS the House went into Committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the 19th section of the Act passed in the now last session of Parliament, chapter 9, respecting Customs and Inland Revenue, by reducing to sixty-three cents per gallon, the duty of excise of sixty-five cents per gallon thereby imposed on spirits manufactured from molasses in bond; and that such reduction of duty shall take effect on and after the day of

in the present year.

The Report was received and the resolution referred for incorporation in the Bill.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

On motion of Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER the House went into Committee to consider a resolution on the subject of the Library of Parliament, and the salaries of the Librarian and other officers and servants.

Resolution reported, when the Committee rose.

The House at twelve adjourned till Saturday.

THE SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

After routine,

Hon. Mr. ODELL enquired to whom the Senate was indebted for the three beautiful specimens of art which now graced the Chamber, and who was responsible for their placement, as serious damage was done to the statue of Her Majesty by the gross carelessness and incompetency of

the person entrusted with erecting the statue. An employee of the Government who when remonstrated with on the slowness of the rope used for raising the statue said to him (Mr. Odell) that he knew his business, and was responsible.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST defended the employee, who was a Frenchman, with poor knowledge of English.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated that the statue and two busts were the property of and made by Marshall Wood, who asked leave to place them where they were with the assistance of the Board of Works. He regretted that LaRose, the employee, should have shown impertinence to a member of the House.

A number of bills from the Commons were read a first time.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL presented the report of the Director of Penitentiaries.

The Insolvent Act Amendment Bill was taken into consideration.

Hon. Messrs. DICKEY and Tessier remarked upon the ill working of the whole measure.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN thought it was time it was repealed altogether.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

Customs Duties Amendment Bill was read a second time.

Hon. Mr. McPHERSON hoped the Act would determine the permanent policy of the Dominion, and we would never again see a tax on the necessities of life, or for creating monopolies.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE would like to see agricultural implements included in the free list.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL stated that the Canal Commissioners' report, with maps, would be distributed shortly.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL moved that the Clerk lay on the table an account of all sums paid to Senators for mileage and indemnity this session.

It being 6 o'clock, the House rose for recess:

AFTER RECESS.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—

Fishing by Foreign Vessels.

Quebec Harbour Improvement.

Hudson Bay Company Loan.

Trinity House, Quebec, Amended.

Bank of Upper Canada Amendment.

On Banks and Banking,

Hon. Mr. RYAN presented and read a petition from the Montreal Board of Trade, praying for amendments.

Act for incorporating Commercial Bank, New Brunswick, was also passed.

Kingston and Pembroke Railway and Windsor Board of Trade Bills were read a second time.

The House adjourned at 8:30 till Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1871.

After routine,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that it was the desire of the Government if assisted by the hon. members opposite to prorogue Parliament on Wednesday next.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that Government might safely assume that everyone in this House was anxious to have business brought to a close as soon as possible, but they owed a duty to the public to give due consideration to every measure brought before them, all of the most important orders on the papers were yet in a very incomplete state. The supplementary estimates were very large and he did not see how it was possible that Parliament could be prorogued on Wednesday. The sessional indemnity was based on a session of one hundred days and it was rather unfair that hon. members should endeavor to rush business through before the House was sixty days in session.

The SPEAKER read a petition from Wm. Dease requesting the appointment of a Committee to examine into the elections in Provencher, for which he claimed to be the rightful member, on the ground that the person who proposed his opponent was not a qualified voter at the time and for other reasons.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON after a short discussion, said that the House could act upon the communication as on a regular election petition.

The subject was dropped.

THE ELECTION BILL.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the second reading of the amendments made in Committee of the Whole to the election Bill. He said the Government had no objection to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Hochelaga, which was to give municipalities power to divide polling districts when necessary.

The House accordingly went into committee to adopt the amendment.

On the motion for concurrence,

Hon. Mr. DORION moved that the report be not now concurred in, but that it

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

be referred back to Committee of the Whole with a view to provide that in the Province of Quebec the Returning officers in a city or town shall be one of the councillors, in counties and ridings the Warden and Secretary-Treasurer and that in the other Provinces the several officials who are by-law now qualified to act at the local elections.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government could not accept this amendment, in consequence of the necessity of providing a temporary Act to meet the requirements of the Provinces later brought into the Union. It would be necessary to leave some discretion with the Government as to the appointment of officers.

Hon. Mr. BLANCHET said this amendment if adopted would be inconvenient in his county [Levis] on account of the fact that there were numbers of persons qualified for the position of Returning officers and it would be hard to decide which to take.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said some good reason should be given for making a change like this. It was necessary there should be some discretionary power somewhere, and as the system had worked well, why should not the principles of the Union Act be adhered to.

Mr. MACKENZIE denied that the system had worked well, as in his own county, a person had been appointed Returning officer, who was a strong partisan, and offensive to the majority of the people. If the Government would only leave the law as it stood before Confederation in the old Province of Canada, he would be fully satisfied. He thought the Government would be better with the responsibility taken off their shoulders.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he would infer from the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that he was opposed to the reform of Mr. Baldwin in the old election law of the Province of Canada. The Hon. Minister of Militia, however, seemed to take a different and to his (Mr. Holton's) mind a better view of it. The reform of Mr. Baldwin was to prevent the Government from abusing the control they had of the public patronage. It had been found to be a necessary reform, and, no doubt, it would be an equally wise provision to incorporate in the Bill before the House.

Mr. BLAKE instanced another case in which the system had not worked well in respect of the appointment of the Returning officer, who had been offered the position by the first Minister of the Crown on condition that he would retire, he being then a candidate. He advocated that the

old system before Confederation should be reverted to.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS condemned the introduction of any such statement as the last speaker had made of an offer being made by the first Minister of the Crown to induce a candidate to retire, at a time when the first Minister was not in his seat and could not reply to the assertion. He was quite sure that if that Minister were present, he would give the assertion a proper answer.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said the law of Nova Scotia made the Sheriff the Returning Officer. The Sheriff was appointed annually by the Government of the day, and consequently it gave the Local Government great influence in the elections. He mentioned as an instance of this, the last election of the Hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces, the hon. member for Hants. In that election Mr. Wilkins, the Attorney General for the Province, who was a violent anti-Unionist, travelled all the way from Halifax to Windsor, a distance of forty-five miles, to remind the Returning officer for Hants that he held his office from the Local Government, and proceeded to place in his hands written instructions as to what he (Mr. Wilkins) contended was the law defining the duties of Returning officers to the House of Commons. An illustration of that kind was quite sufficient to show to this House the gross impropriety of giving such power to the Local Governments.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Did Mr. Wilkins succeed?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—No; the instructions given to the Sheriff were so grossly illegal that he refused to obey them, and Mr. Wilkins himself could not enforce them, for he felt that he had jeopardised his position. A weaker man might have been frightened easier into obeying the instructions.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL was sorry that he could not concur with the arguments addressed from the Opposition side of the House. He believed that the Government should have the appointing of these officers, that they might hold them responsible if they should be guilty of undue interference in the elections. He did not think it was quite safe or prudent for the House to resign the control they possessed over these Returning officers.

Hon. Mr. HOWE corroborated the statement of the Hon. President of the Council as to the proceedings taken in Nova Scotia at the elections.

Mr. BARTHE was opposed to a uniform system throughout the Dominion, as what was suitable to one Province might not be

suitable to another. He was also opposed to give the Government discretionary power in the appointment of the Returning Officers. In his own county, for instance, an officer was appointed personally opposed to him (Mr. Barthe) and great injustice had thus been done. The Government had exercised an undue influence at the election in his county, and he should support the amendment.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said if undue influence had been used he had no knowledge of it. The hon. member had done very wrong not to mention this sooner. He should have informed not only the Dominion Government but the Government of Quebec if undue influence had really been exercised, so that the officer at fault might have been discharged.

Hon. Mr. DORION'S amendment was then put, and the vote taken as follows:—Yeas, 38; nays, 90.

Mr. TREMBLAY proposed an amendment to introduce the system of voting by ballot throughout the Dominion. He quoted from speeches of Mr. Gladstone in support of it, and said that in the United States, Belgium and other countries where it was in force, it had worked most beneficially. As long as human nature remained unchanged, it was necessary to provide measures for the prevention of bribery, corruption and intimidation at elections, and this could best be effected by the ballot.

The House divided on the amendment with the following result:—Yeas, 39; nays, 90.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved in amendment an addition to the Bill to prevent dual representation. He had found his colleagues so unanimous in their approval of this amendment that he would not have said anything on the subject, but his motion had been objected to on the ground that it was opposed to a system which had really been adopted by the House, but he denied that that system had been adopted as a principle, as the measure introduced on the subject had reference only to Ontario and Quebec. His motion had only reference to the Lower Provinces, and he left the matter in the hands of the House.

Mr. BLAKE said the true remedy for the evil complained of was for the Local Legislatures who objected to dual representation to disqualify members of the Dominion Parliament from sitting in the Provincial Legislatures.

The amendment was rejected on the following division:—Yeas, 57; nays, 63.

Mr. YOUNG moved an amendment to the Bill, to provide that the elections be held on one and the same day. There was no doubt that public opinion was

strongly in favour of his motion, and he hoped Government would accede to it.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was obvious that the motion must be resisted by the Government. The system proposed was not adopted in England, which was acknowledged to possess the best political institutions in the world, and Canada, in order to gain force and strength, was adopting as much as possible the practice of the old country—the mover had been obliged to make special provision for Algoma, Manitoba, and British Columbia, and so proved that his principle was wrong. If the system was good for four Provinces, why should it not be good for the whole Dominion. There was no doubt as to the objectionable nature of the proposal, and he need only mention that in the late election in Ontario, the friends of the hon. member for West Durham had thought it safer, in order to secure the presence of that hon. member in the Local Legislature, to have him nominated for two Constituencies. He had full confidence in leaving the matter in the hands of the House.

Mr. BLAKE said that he had never doubted his election for South Bruce, and had not sought the nomination for Durham.

The vote on the amendment resulted as follows:—Yeas 56, nays 66.

Mr. MILLS moved an amendment that at all general elections, the same polling day should be appointed for the election in each Province, though different days might be appointed for the different Provinces. The vote was yeas 58, nays 65.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

The debate on the Election Bill was resumed.

Mr. FOURNIER moved that the 82nd section, chapter 6, of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, be re-enacted. The clause is for the prevention of bribery and intimidation in any shape or form at elections.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government had not the slightest objection to adopt the most stringent measures to prevent corruption at elections. In 1858-9 Mr. Ogle R. Gowan enacted in the Act called the Lafontaine Act, a clause even more rigorous than the 82nd clause, which consequently disappeared. This amendment just now proposed went even further, and proposed to throw the whole responsibility of selling liquor on election day, whether vendued at a licensed tavern or in "any other house." He thought

Mr. Young.

the words "any other house" should be struck out.

Hon. Mr. DORION said the clause which had been struck out in 1858-9 was the penal clause which he was glad to see his hon. friend was about to restore.

Mr. GEOFFRION said the words "any other house," were very necessary in the amendment as a candidate might instruct some friend to treat the electors at a private house.

The House went into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. GEOFFRION in the chair.

The Bill was reported as amended.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved an amendment to disqualify employees of the Dominion Government from voting at elections for the House of Commons, and imposing a fine of \$200 for each and such offence, and declaring the vote null and void. He said it was an old law which had long prevailed in Lower Canada, which he desired to re-enact since the ballot had been rejected by the House. Some such provisions as this should be introduced into the Bill.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER reminded his hon. friend that this measure was merely a temporary one, and it would hardly be fair to introduce into it such a sweeping clause as this. The Superannuation Act made the Government officers, to a certain extent, independent, and the Government would never proceed to the length of discharging an employee for voting against a Government candidate. He considered the amendment ill-timed and he would therefore vote against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Guysboro') said the amendment of the hon. gentleman would prove to be futile if its object was to prevent the Government from influencing elections, for each employee of the Government, although he might not be allowed to vote, could exercise his influence in favour of the Government candidate.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said that under the laws of New Brunswick every Government official with a certain salary could vote, and the proposition was to deprive them of the right to do so. In England all these officials were allowed to vote, and he could not think that the House would sanction that some thousands of people throughout the Dominion should be deprived of the franchise.

Hon. Mr. DORION said that the telegram which the Minister of Customs had acknowledged he had sent was quite a sufficient justification of the amendment he proposed, and he was sure if the officials themselves were consulted they would desire to have no votes.

Mr. MASSON, (Soulanges) said the hon. member for Hochelaga was certainly not consistent in his proposition. He (Mr. Masson) was in favour of universal suffrage, and certainly so important a class as the officials should not be excluded.

Mr. CURRIER saw no reason why Government officials should not have as much right to vote as anyone else, and he for one had never seen any undue influence exerted by the Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the motion of his hon. friend was practically to revert to the system in force before consideration. The hon. member for Hochelaga had been charged with inconsistency in the present motion, but this motion would not have been proposed had the ballot been accepted. He thought, however, the motion was too sweeping, as certainly he thought Postmasters should be allowed to vote.

Mr. SCATCHERD was not inclined to disqualify any one who was not at present disqualified; on the contrary he thought there were many now disqualified who ought to vote.

Mr. BLAKE said as the voting was open in Nova Scotia, the employees ought to be disqualified, but as the ballot existed in New Brunswick, they might be allowed to vote. He, therefore, moved an amendment that in Nova Scotia, the same classes of Government servants should be excluded as were excluded in Ontario and Quebec.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER did not think any sufficient reason had been shown for the proposition just placed before the House. The last general election in Nova Scotia fully proved that Government influence had no control over public opinion. There were on the other hand very serious objections to the proposition, it would produce two evils. It would induce the influential intelligent men who would otherwise accept Government appointments, to refuse them when accompanied by the degrading condition that they should lose the right to use their just influence and to exercise their right to vote, and further, it would induce those called upon to nominate persons for appointments to nominate the most feeble and incompetent men to office—and as it was most important that the service of the most influential and the most intelligent men should be obtained for the public service, the effects of the proposition would be most mischievous.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the proposition was merely to apply to Nova Scotia the rule in force in Ontario and Quebec. If the arguments of the Hon. President of the Council were good for anything, it was the bounden duty of that hon. gentleman to

allow those officials in Ontario and Quebec, who were now excluded to exercise the franchise.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER supposed the hon. gentleman intended that they ought to adopt the system existing in England.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON—Certainly, if the other principle now forming part of the policy of the Imperial Government, the ballot, was adopted.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said the measure the Government proposed would have every Province in its former position. It was most unwise to allow a Local Government to step in and declare who should vote at elections for members of the House of Commons.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that as the Bill before the House was merely a temporary measure, this was not the time to discuss a general system with regard to whether or not Government officials should vote. At present, the rule in this respect was different in each Province, whereas the motion of the member for West Durham would imply that the same rule existed in Ontario and Quebec, which was not correct. The motion was not to establish a uniform system, because the hon. member admitted that he did not wish to interfere with New Brunswick, and, therefore, such a motion should not be introduced in a temporary measure. The hon. member excepted New Brunswick, but if a public officer had no right to vote in one place because he was a public officer, he ought not to vote anywhere.

Hon. Mr. DORION said he had not contended that it was immoral for a public officer to vote, but that it was unjust and degrading to an employee to be coerced into voting for a Government candidate. As long as voting should be open these men should not be enfranchised.

A vote was then taken on Mr. BLAKE'S amendment which was yeas 47, nays 83.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment that whereas in Ontario and Quebec the elections for the Dominion Parliament are held under the same rules as the Local election, and whereas in New Brunswick Dominion employees are qualified to vote, but the mode of voting is secret, therefore the general elections in Nova Scotia shall be conducted under the Local rules.

The amendment was lost on the same division as the preceding one.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved that an amendment be introduced to provide that contested elections be tried and decided by Courts of Justice as Local contested elections in Ontario and New Brunswick, and municipal elections in Quebec are tried.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he would vote against this amendment, not because he disapproved of the mode of trial suggested, but because it would require more machinery to manage it properly than existed at present, and because it was too late to take up such a measure and deal with it at this late period in the session. There were quite a number of contested elections to be tried in Ontario under the new system, and it might be as well to wait till next session when the House could have the experience of the Local Legislature to guide them.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that if the member for Lanark approved the principle he had no right to oppose it because of the period at which it chanced to be presented. However, hon. members might desire prorogation, it was the duty of the House to take full time to perfect every measure before it.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN had some experience on Election Committees, and was decidedly of opinion that some change was absolutely required in the mode of deciding controverted elections. He approved of the abstract principle of the proposition and should therefore vote for it.

Hon. Mr. DORION'S amendment was then put with the following result:—Yeas, 50; nays, 80.

Mr. CAMPBELL [Guysborough] moved an amendment to provide for the appointment of Commissioners to revise the lists of voters in Nova Scotia so as to place them all voters who were entitled to vote at the time of Confederation, but who had since been disfranchised by Acts of the Local Legislature. He explained the circumstances under which he considered the motion necessary.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER understood that the present motion was simply to make the lists the same as they were on the 1st of July, 1867.

Mr. MACKENZIE did not think the particulars of the amendment bore out the statement made to the House. It was provided that a new list should be made out, and there was no appeal from or check on the Commissioner. There was also full power to excise certain names.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that the understanding of the House was clear, and if there was anything in the clauses contrary to that understanding, it would not be adapted in Committee.

Mr. BLAKE thought the motion before the House should be clear, and he thought the proper way to meet the case was for the revisers when preparing lists for the local election to prepare like lists of electors for the Dominion Government,

Hon. Mr. MacDougall.

adding thereto the names of all those who had been disfranchised since the time of Confederation by the Local Government. He moved an amendment to that effect.

Mr. CAMPBELL said that the Revisers in Nova Scotia were obliged to make the lists by the 1st of March, therefore, if any election took place before next year, the old law would govern.

Mr. MACDONALD [Antigonish] said this House should provide its own machinery for making out the voters' list.

Mr. BOWELL said the revisers were officers of the Local Government, and might refuse to make out the lists.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that if it was true that public opinion in Nova Scotia was unfavourable to the Local Government, it was not likely that Revisers would be appointed otherwise than friendly to the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE said the Dominion Government had full power to appoint any one they chose, and also to inflict penalties for non-performance of the duties. The member for Guysborough proposed to appoint Commissioners, and he (Mr. Blake) proposed to do the same, but, in addition, to name those Commissioners.

Mr. KILLAM said the Nova Scotia law allowed full time for the preparation of the lists by the Revisers.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said the House seemed to be very much in the dark as to what they wanted to do. The safest way of choosing proper persons was to choose the Revisers. He thought it very undesirable that a Commissioner should be appointed sole judge in this matter, but the authority should be confined to the real want.

Mr. MACDONALD (Lunenburg) said the proposal was clear, and the authority assigned to the Commissioner definite and concise, to add to the voters lists every one who would be on those lists according to the law in force at the time of Union.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the House would be maintaining its dignity if it refused to allow a few hon. members to wreak their vengeance on members of their Local Government, and it was tiresome in the extreme to hear those constant and repeated complaints.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER had perfect confidence in the Revisers as Commissioners, as the duty was so simple that no mistake could occur, and if there was time for the Revisers to do the work, he was fully satisfied to let them do so.

Mr. BLAKE said that Revisers were able to submit lists up to 10th May.

Mr. CAMPBELL said a further law had been passed fixing the day as 20th April.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said that would allow ample time.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said he was fully satisfied with anything that would obtain the simple object desired. What he complained of was the disqualifications enacted by the Local Legislature, and if they were agreed that these should be revoked, let them go into Committee to frame a clause that would meet the case. He was in favour of the sheriffs doing the work.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the object desired by the member for Guysborough was assented to by the motion of the member for West Durham, but it was urged that the revision might have been so far proceeded with as to prevent the addition desired. He would suggest an alteration providing that if the time had elapsed, it should be extended.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN said the best plan would be for the persons affected to present themselves at the poll and record their votes.

Mr. ROSS [Victoria] was in favour of the appointment of the revisers.

Mr. BLAKE altered his amendment in accordance with the suggestion of Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

Mr. SAVARY said it was necessary to make a separate list of voters for the Dominion elections, in accordance with the laws at the 1st July, 1867, and it was immaterial who did the work, but revisers would cost much more than commissioners, as they would be much more numerous.

Mr. BLAKE'S amendment was carried.

Mr. CAMPBELL'S amendment, as amended, was carried, and the House went into Committee to amend the Bill accordingly.

The amendment was read a second time.

Mr. DREW moved an amendment to provide that the polling sub-divisions in Ontario shall be the same as those used in the election for the Local Legislature. — Carried.

The Bill was then reported from Committee as amended, read a third time and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked at what time the St. Lawrence Canals would be opened for trade?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Welland Canal was already opened. He could not say when the other St. Lawrence Canals would be opened, but preparations were being made to open them at an earlier period than usual, in consequence of the early breaking up of winter. He

had seen a telegram from Montreal this evening in which it was stated that although the river was open opposite the city, that the ice still remained in the bays and basins.

The subject was dropped.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed.

Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbour of Quebec.

Act to authorize the sale of Oakville Harbour.

Bill to amend the Act respecting Insurance Companies (as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.)

The House adjourned at midnight till Monday at 1 p. m.

THE SENATE.

MONDAY, 10th April, 1871

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. SEYMOUR, seconded by Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, it was ordered, that the letter of Alfred Garneau, Esquire, one of the French Translators of the Senate, laid before the House on Saturday last, be expunged from the Journal.

Hon. Messrs. SANBORN, DICKEY, MITCHELL, CAMPBELL, and others referred to the useful character of the labours of the Committee, and their economical tendency.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST stated that the writer regretted having written the letter, and now asked permission to withdraw it.

[The letter in question reflected on the second report of the Committee on Contingent Accounts, which stated in reference to the petition of Mr. Montizambert, Law Clerk, that the Committee were "unwilling to depart from the recommendation made by the Committee on Contingent Accounts, on the ninth day of June, 1869, and adopted by the Senate against re-opening the question of Salaries."]

Hon. Mr. SANBORN, from the Committee, on Standing and Private Bills, reported against the Bill intituled "An Act to Incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. SANBORN, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency

the Governor-General praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a return of all the cases, in the Dominion of Canada, in which sentences of corporal punishment have been carried into effect, with a statement of the ages of the criminals, the nature of the offences committed, the names of the judges, magistrates, or justices, who passed the sentences, the number of the lashes ordered to be administered in each case, the instruments with which they have been inflicted, and of the time which elapsed between the infliction of the punishment and the discharge of the prisoner.

The question of concurrence being put thereon, the same was resolved in the affirmative, and it was ordered that such members of the Privy Council as are members of this House do wait upon His Excellency the Governor-General with the said Address.

Several Bills were received from the House of Commons.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. Mr. WARK, from the Select Committee appointed to enquire into, and report on all matters connected with the survey, location and construction of the Intercolonial Railway since the appointment of the Commissioners, presented their Report, as follows:—

The Select Committee appointed to enquire into, and report on all matters connected with the survey, location and construction of the Intercolonial Railway since the appointment of the Commissioners, beg leave to report that they spent much time in examining the numerous accounts and other documents submitted to them, as well as in eliciting information from one of the Commissioners, the Secretary and the Accountant; but owing to the prospect of an early close of the Session, they find it impossible to give such extensive and careful consideration to the subject as would enable them fully to report thereon. The Committee have felt that an enquiry of this kind would be greatly facilitated by having the Commissioners' Annual Report before them, and therefore recommend that, in future the Commissioners be instructed by the Government to have their Report prepared and printed in time to be laid before Parliament immediately after the opening of the Session.

Report ordered for consideration on following day.

RAILWAY BILL.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON moved a second reading of the Bill intituled "An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie

Hon. Mr. Christie

Railway and Bridge Company." The hon. gentleman stated that the object of the Bill was to incorporate a Company to construct a railway from the Village of Sault Ste. Marie, in the District of Algoma, to connect with the projected railways in the Province of Ontario, at or near Lake Nipissing, and to extend a branch therefrom to connect with the Toronto, Simcoe, and Muskoka Junction Railway, at or near Bracebridge in the County of Victoria, with power to construct a railway bridge across the river St. Mary, at or near the Sault Ste. Marie, to connect with the railways in the State of Michigan.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL considered the construction of such a railway very important in view of a future railway to the Pacific.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN said that the Bill must be taken in connection with the remarks of the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. MacPherson) during the British Columbia debate.

The Bill was referred to the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

The House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 19th, 1871.

After Routine,

An Act to authorize the Northern Railway Company of Canada to make agreements for the leasing, using and working of the lines of railway of other Companies (as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines), was read a second and third time, and passed.

THE MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) said before proceeding any further with the public business, he wished to draw attention to the fact that it was reported publicly that the member for Provencher had been a member of Riel's Government, and, if so, the hon. member was guilty of high treason. It was also said that the hon. member had been a member of the Court-martial which had condemned Scott, if so, the hon. member was guilty of murder. He (Mr. Ross) thought it was due to that hon. gentleman himself and to the House, that he should set himself right. It was much better to take this step now than to leave the matter unsettled, for there was a good deal said through the country about it. There was a feeling among the people, that any one connected with such an atrocious murder, should be brought to justice. He

(Mr. Ross) had heard that Riel was frequently in Manitoba, and he did not understand, if it were so, why the Local Government had not arrested him.

Mr. DELORME (Provencher) said the rumors were false. He knew nothing about the murder till two days after it was committed (cheers). He had nothing to do with Riel's Council. When Mr. Smith was sent as a Commissioner by the Canadian Government to Manitoba, he (Mr. Delorme) was a delegate at the convention (cheers).

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) said it would be in the recollection of most of the members of this House, that a certain party in Red River got up a Council last winter, which was called the Provisional Government. That was composed of Mr. Riel and several French members. With that Council, he was well aware, the hon. member had nothing to do (cheers).

He also referred to the events connected with his mission to the people of the North West. He agreed to the public meeting which was held on the 18th and 19th January. Members were freely elected to that convention by both sides. The Convention met in February and were occupied in discussing the so-called Bill of Rights. That discussion was as free and unrestrained as any discussion in the House up to a certain point. The hon. member for Provencher was a member of the Convention. Then, and not until then, had the hon. gentleman anything to do with the disturbances or insurrection at Red River [hear, hear]. He never heard anything mooted against Mr. Delorme until the other day, and certainly had he believed there was any foundation for the charge, he [Mr. Smith] would not only have hesitated, but actually refused to have been in anywise instrumental in introducing the hon. member before this House, as he had done. He would have regarded it as unbecoming his position as a member of this House, and still more as an insult to his honor if he thought the hon. member had been in any way connected with the so-called court martial [hear, hear]. As to who constituted that court martial he did not know, but this he could gainsay, that Mr. Delorme was one of those people who arrogated to themselves the power to sit in judgment on a British subject and condemn him to death. There was a further convention and delegation which was sometimes called the House of Assembly of Red River. To that, he believed, the hon. gentleman had also been elected, but, elected by his parish. He [Mr. Smith] took some little part in bringing that Assembly together. A great deal had been said about that—a great deal erroneously. What was done at that

time was this: There was at that time a gentleman from Canada condemned to death. Intercession had been made for him by several parties, but without avail. At a late hour in the evening he [Mr. Smith] visited those who were then in power and it was given him to understand that they were absolutely in favour of the union with Canada, and merely desired to have the people of Red River come to an understanding exactly on what terms and conditions they were to enter the Confederation. He assented, so far as his assent was necessary, on behalf of Canada to this Council being called, and further said he would go amongst the people and induce them to take part in this Council or Convention, but, absolutely and only with the view of making arrangements for a union with Canada. Of that Convention the hon. member for Provencher was also a member. He believed that having said so, he had said all that was necessary on the subject. There was in the first instance a Council called the Provisional Government—the member for Provencher had nothing to do with that. In the Convention of which the hon. gentleman was subsequently a member, there were several gentlemen who took part in it, not simply because they happened to be present, but they actually took a more active part in bringing matters forward than the French speaking members, and there could be no imputation against their loyalty (hear, hear). Further, he might say that he fully believed that there were none who deplored the sad events of last winter more than the people of Red River, not only the English, but the French-speaking population of Red River (cheers).

Mr. ROSS said the hon. member had distinctly stated that he did not know who composed the Court Martial. If so, how did he know that the hon. member for Provencher was not a member of it. (cries of Oh, Oh! and confusion).

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS.—It is entirely out of order. The hon. member has asked a question and got a reply. What more does he want?

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Prince Edward's was quite in order. He had but called attention to the fact that the hon. member for Selkirk had not in this particular corroborated the statement.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL moved the following resolution:—

"Mr. Walter Ross, Member for Prince Edward's County, having stated that he had reason to fear that Pierre Delorme, Esq., who on the 5th inst., was introduced as a member of this House, had been con-

cerned in rebellion against the authority by law established in Hudson's Bay Territory, which was lately quelled by Her Majesty's troops, and more directly implicated in the murder of one Thos. Scott, a British subject, by persons in arms against the Crown in that territory. Resolved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the truth of these allegations, to report proceedings which ought to be taken in order to relieve this House of the disgrace and dishonor of receiving amongst its members any one guilty of these offences, and that said Committee be composed of Hon. Messrs. Morris, Dorion and Cameron and Messrs. Street, D. A. Macdonald, E. Blake and Gibbs." He said if it were true that the hon. member for Provencher had not been connected with Riel's Council it should be proved and made plain in the most public manner. He did not think that the mere statement made by the hon. member himself in such an imperfect way was sufficient. He thought there was none who should be more anxious than the hon. member himself that a Committee should be appointed to investigate the matter and report to this House. The hon. member for Selkirk would see when his speech was published that his statements were not quite in conformity with some of the facts which had been made public respecting this North West difficulty.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the discussion was out of order. The hon. member should give due notice before moving a resolution.

Hon. W. MACDOUGALL said it was perfectly obvious that if a notice of two days were required this matter could not be investigated this session.

The SPEAKER ruled that it rested with the House to decide whether the resolution could be moved without notice.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved in amendment to Mr. Macdougall's motion, that the matter be referred to the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to be considered forthwith.

Mr. BLAKE said the distinct statements made by the hon. members for Provencher and Selkirk were quite satisfactory to his own mind. [hear, hear]. He thought that the country owed a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for bringing up this matter in the House. It appeared to him that the distinct statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite were quite enough, and that there was no necessity for the appointment of a committee. However, he did not at all object to having it investigated by a Committee. He deprecated any attempt at turning the wicked, unprovoked, damnable murder

which had occurred in the North West into a matter of nationality or creed. It was one that had not been looked after by the constituted authorities of this country, and he believed they would receive the condemnation of all classes in this Dominion for having neglected to punish the murderers. He had not taken any steps thus far in the matter because when he had brought it up in the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, it had there been declared that the House had no right to take any action in the matter. When he had failed there, where the public were unanimous in condemning the murderers, he had little hope of being successful in this House. He thought he would leave it to those who had thought proper to impute to him improper motives in bringing it up in the Local Legislature.

Mr. JONES (Leeds) charged the member for Durham with heartlessness in trying to make political capital out of the murder of Scott. He (Mr. Blake) had stated that he did not look upon this as a local or a religious question; that he considered it far removed above anything of that kind. He thought that those persons who implied that the French Roman Catholics desired to make it a question of this kind did not do them justice. But if it was neither a local or sectarian question, if there were no local or religious prejudices involved in its discussion, why had the honourable member for Durham brought it up in the Local Legislature of Ontario instead of bringing it before the Dominion Parliament. Certainly, if either Legislature had any right to deal with it, it was the Parliament of the Dominion (hear, hear). It was the Dominion Government, and not that of Ontario, that appointed the Governor of Manitoba, and any influence exercised must be exercised by the Dominion and not by the Local Government. If this was not a question of religion or nationality why was it brought up before a legislative body, almost all the members of which were Protestants, instead of before this House where there are representatives of all creeds. He denounced Mr. Blake's action as a barefaced attempt to make political capital out of the murder of Scott, and out of those religious animosities which every patriotic man desires should be altogether obliterated and forgotten.

Mr. FERGUSON said the Local Legislature of Ontario was not the right place to bring up a matter of this kind. Here, in this Parliament, was the place to discuss the matter, and here the hon. member should force the matter on the attention of the Executive instead of bringing his buncombe resolutions up in a House that had nothing to do with the case.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

Mr. SMITH said the hon. member for North Lanark, who seemed to take upon himself the championship of the North West people, had declared that the statements he (Smith) had made would not be borne out by facts. He merely wished to say in reply that he could substantiate every statement he had made.

Hon. Mr. DORION said if proof was necessary to corroborate the denial of the hon. member for Provencher, none better could be asked for than that furnished by the hon. member for Selkirk. Yet, in the face of all this an hon. member rose in his place and moved a resolution to try an hon. member on a mere rumour. It was most unfair at this late hour of the session to treat any member of this House in such an unfair manner—to send him home with the imputation hanging over him that he was guilty of so great a crime that it was found necessary to bring him to trial. There was no positive declaration that the hon. member had done anything wrong and the House should be very careful, therefore, before proceeding to such an unjudicial act. He hoped the hon. member for Lanark would withdraw his motion. If not, he (Hon. Mr. Dorion) would move an amendment to it, that there was no case to bring before a Committee of this House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said this discussion only proved how right he (Sir George) was in raising a point of order at the outset. He knew very well that there was no actual charge to proceed upon. He merely moved his amendment to show that the Government had no hesitation in giving the best opportunity of investigating the matter. The view taken by the hon. member for Hochelaga, was the view taken by the Government, but they did not wish to give any pretext whatever for a charge against the members for Quebec, that they wished to screen a man who had been guilty of a crime, from justice.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that he would not withdraw his motion, believing as he did, that it was in the interests of this House and of the country that this case should be investigated by a Committee. He dissented entirely from the doctrine propounded by the hon. member for Hochelaga, that the statement of an hon. member, affecting himself, should be accepted without discussion. He had no desire to see the hon. member found guilty, but he would show the House a photograph of Riel's Privy Council, in which the picture of the hon. member for Provencher appeared in proof of the statement of the hon. member for Prince Edward. There

was a Pierre Delorme, a member of that Council, was it the hon. member for Provencher? The hon. gentleman might not have been one of those implicated in the murder, but there had been no proof, except the hon. gentleman's own statement, that he never had been a member of Riel's Council.* The hon. member for Selkirk did not corroborate that denial, and there was every ground, therefore, for investigating the case.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said some hon. member must take upon himself the responsibility of reading some direct charge against the hon. member for Provencher before putting him on his trial. On no other ground could a Committee be granted.

Mr. DELORME, (Provencher), said he had no objection to have the matter tried. He was present with a number of Indians when the photograph in the hands of the hon. member (for Lanark, was taken and his picture was among the number, but there were several there who were not connected with the Council and his picture was among these latter.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON argued that the House could not grant a Committee to whom to refer a mere rumour, which was contradicted by the hon. member whom it affected. It would be establishing a pernicious precedent to carry this motion.

Mr. BLAKE said he understood the hon. member for Provencher to deny that he ever was a member of Riel's Council. On that ground he (Mr. Blake) had asserted that there was no ground for sending this matter to a Committee.

Mr. DELORME.—I never was a member of Riel's Council.

Mr. WHYTE, (Hastings), said if the hon. member for West Durham had pursued the same course in this Legislature that he had followed in the Local House, he (Mr. Whyte) would have aided him to the best of his ability in pressing upon the Government the necessity of punishing the murderer of Scott. He (Mr. Whyte) believed the hon. members who were so anxious to prevent the appointment of a Committee to investigate this matter, desired to make political capital out of it. He would vote for the original motion.

Mr. FERGUSON would support the motion of the hon. member for Lanark on the same ground.

Hon. Mr. DORION moved an amendment, reciting the points brought out in the discussion and resolving that no case had been made out for sending this case to a Committee. He stated that he held in his hand a copy of the photograph

which had been referred to by the hon. member for Lanark, and there appeared in it the portraits of Mr. Spence and other gentlemen who were known to have never been connected with Riel's Council (hear, hear).

Mr. SMITH corroborated the statement of the hon. member for Hochelaga respecting the photograph.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD thought that the discussion should be brought to a close, and hoped the hon. member for Lisgar would inform the House what he knew of the matter.

Dr. SCHULTZ said he had not purposed to speak of the matter at all. He would vote for the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia, and when the case came before the Committee, he would tell all that he knew about the matter. He might say now, however, that when Riel's Council was in session, he (Dr. Schultz) was in prison, and that when Scott's murder took place, he (Dr. Schultz) was making his way towards Lake Superior.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he would have preferred to allow this matter to stand over till next session, but, under the circumstances, he saw nothing for it but to vote for the motion of the Hon. Minister of Militia, especially as the hon. member for Provencher had asked for the appointment of a Committee.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said there was but one view to take of it. Was there any case to bring before the Committee? He had not heard any made out, and whether the hon. member for Provencher desired to have his case sent before a Committee or not, the House should consider the matter as it stood, quite irrespective of the wishes of any member in this House.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER quite agreed with the remarks which had just fallen from the hon. member for Chateaugay. He challenged the hon. member for Lanark to find a precedent in British Parliamentary practice for the course which he had taken. He (Dr. Tupper) approved of the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga, although he could quite understand the motives which had induced the Hon. Minister of Militia to propose the amendment which he had moved.

Mr. O'CONNOR would vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Hochelaga.

Mr. FORTIN denied that the hon. member for Provencher had asked for a Committee, he had merely said he had no objection to have the case investigated by the Committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Antigonish) approved of the motion of the hon. member for Hochelaga.

Hon. Mr. Dorion.

Some misunderstanding having arisen as to the statement made by Mr. Ross, out of which the discussion arose, he was requested to repeat it, which he did.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was obvious that the hon. member was mistaken as to the basis of his motion, and he hoped the hon. member would withdraw or modify it.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL refused to do so. He said he was not mistaken, and that he desired to have a record of the events placed on the journals of the House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER hoped the hon. member for Lanark would not press his motion after the distinct denial of the hon. member for Provencher and the discussion to which the House had just listened.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he would consent to let this matter remain over till next session (cries of "no, no," and "withdraw," from the Ministerial side of the House).

Mr. MACKENZIE said it would be better to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) said the suggestion was unfair to the hon. member for Provencher. In fact, the whole discussion was unjust to that hon. member. After his public denial it should have been dropped. It would never do to let this unfounded charge hang over the hon. member's head till next session.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the hon. member entirely misunderstood him. He was willing to withdraw the motion (cheers).

Mr. MACDONALD (Middlesex) said this matter had been used in the local elections of Ontario and had caught many a good Conservative vote. It was, no doubt, brought into this House at this late hour of the session for the purpose of making political capital out of it in like manner.

The House having refused to allow Hon. Mr. Macdougall to withdraw his motion a division was called for. The amendment moved by Hon. Mr. Dorion was first put, and the vote resulted as follows: Yeas, 94; nays, 46; and the House passed on to the next item.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Béchard, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bolton, Bourassa, Bown, Brousseau, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Campbell, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cayley, Cheval, Chipman, Cimon, Costigan, Coupal, Crawford [B.], Currier, Daoust, Delorme [St. Hyacinthe], Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferris, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron,

Gibbs, Godin, Gray, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, MacDonald [Glengarry], McDonald, (Antigonish), Masson [Soulanges], Masson [Terrebonne], McDougall [Three Rivers], McKeagney, McMillan, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison [Niagara], O'Connor, Paquet, Pelletier, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Ross [Victoria N. S.], Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Ryan [King's N. B.], Savary, Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk) Sproat, Stephenson, Street Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Webb, and Wright (Ottawa County)—94.

NAYS.—Messrs. Ault, Bodwell, Bowell, Bowman, Brown, Burton, Dobbie, Drew, Ferguson, Grover, Jones (Leeds and Grenville) Killam, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald [Lunenburg], Macdonald [Mid-dlessex], MacFarlane, McKenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall [Lanark], McMonies, Metcalfe, Morison [Victoria O.], Munroe, Oliver, Perry, Pickard, Ross (Dundas), Ross [Prince Edward], Rymal, Scatcherd, Schultz, Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Ontario], Walsh, Webb, White [Halton], White [East Hastings], Whitehead, Willson, Wood, Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—46.

MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. BAKER, in the absence of Mr. Workman, moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate this Company.—Motion carried, and the Bill passed through Committee and was read a third time and passed.

DOMINION TELEGRAPH Co.

Mr. CAMERON, (Peel), moved the second reading of the Bill to incorporate this Company—motion carried, and the Bill passed through Committee and was read a third time and passed.

RIEL.

Mr. WHITE, (East Hastings), asked whether the Extradition of Riel for the murder of Thomas Scott, has been demanded; If not, why not? and whether any steps have been taken to bring to trial the murderers of Thomas Scott in the Province of Manitoba; and what instructions, if any, were given to Governor Archibald in reference to the bringing to trial of said murderers.

Hon. Sir G. CARTIER said that at the time of the murder the Dominion had no authority in the matter and could not, therefore, demand the extradition of Riel. The Extradition Act under the Ashburton Treaty did not extend to the North West,

and if it had extended there, it did not include the crime of high treason, or murder in furtherance of high treason. As to the second question, the administration of criminal justice did not rest with the Dominion Government, but with the Local Government, and as to any instructions to Governor Archibald, all such instructions had been laid before the House, but no instructions could be given him on such a subject, as the matter rested with him and his responsible advisers selected under the Constitution.

INSPECTION OF FISH.

Mr. FOURNIER moved an address to His Excellency for copies of all correspondence respecting the inspection of fish.—Carried.

ADMISSION OF PROVINCES INTO THE DOMINION.

Mr. MILLS moved that the House should go into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the admission of Provinces into the Union. He said he did not desire any discussion, but simply that the Resolutions should be recorded on the Journals of the House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said as the hon. member only desired to record his Resolutions he would move that the debate be adjourned.—Carried.

MILITARY EXPEDITION TO MANITOBA.

Mr. MASSON (Soulanges) moved an address for all correspondence respecting the soldiers forming part of the military Expedition.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was no such correspondence in the possession of the Dominion Government though there might be some between the Imperial Government and its officers.

Mr. MASSON said many reports had reached Canada of disorders created by the soldiers, and he desired to know whether there was any official information on the subject in the possession of the Government. When Riel and the unfortunate half-breeds created some disturbances, troops were at once sent to quell the disorder, but instead of keeping the peace they had broken the peace, and no steps were taken to punish them. He maintained that the people had the right to resist the entrance of one who was not their proper Governor, and to ask the protection of the British flag. A man named Goulet, on suspicion of being one of Riel's Cabinet, had been pursued by the soldiers to the bank of the river and killed there, and another man named Lepine,

was threatened with assault and death if he were seen in the neighbourhood. One of the volunteers had been put in jail for some offence and had been rescued by his comrades, and one of the officers had been insulted and even wounded. He did not desire to defend Goulet or Lepine, but such acts as these on the part of the volunteers ought not to be passed by unnoticed.

Mr. BOWELL said he understood the remarks of the hon. member referred to the Volunteers from Ontario.

Mr. MASSON said he had not mentioned the Volunteers of any particular Province.

Mr. BOWELL said he thought he was justified in considering that the Ontario Volunteers were referred to, and he desired to say that the member for Lisgar had had pointedly and distinctly stated in his seat that the reports in circulation in reference to the Volunteers in Manitoba were totally untrue. He held in his hand a copy of a resolution passed at a public meeting in Manitoba, stating that the Volunteers had been insulted, abused and misrepresented without just cause, and that the meeting could testify to their excellent conduct. He thought it was only justice that the facts should be known.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was no objection to the motion.

Carried.

STERLING'S CLAIM.

Mr. CURRIER moved for a select Committee on return of correspondence respecting this claim against the Government.

The SPEAKER ruled on the point of order previously raised, that the motion was in order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought it was the duty of the Government to resist such a reference, as they ought to be fully prepared to accept the responsibility of a proper settlement of the claim, and if the Government admitted the reference, they admitted a want of confidence in themselves.

Mr. MACDONALD [Glengarry] knew of three other claims that would be presented if this were passed.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the previous Minister of Public Works had refused the claim. It was afterwards referred to the Minister of Justice who reported there was no legal claim, and this had been communicated to the Petitioner.

Mr. MACDONALD repeated that if this claim were entertained, it would open the door to numbers.

Mr. CURRIER said that if any one had a just claim against the Government, the House ought to consider it.

Mr. Masson.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that though the Committee might be appointed, nothing further could be done by it, and he had quite enough confidence in the Minister of Public Works to sustain his decision.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said there were many difficulties in the matter, but he thought there was no harm in getting the report of a Committee. He thought the claim was rather one against the old Province of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE opposed the reference as the Government ought to be the judges in the matter.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said that if there might be no legal claim and it were paid, the Ontario Government might object to have it charged against them. He opposed the reference to a Committee as equivalent to a vote of want of confidence.

Dr. GRANT testified to the justness of the claim, and thought a Committee should be appointed and the matter considered.

The motion was put to the House with the following result; yeas, 44; nays, 72.

YEAS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Barthe, Beaty, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bown, Burton, Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Costigan, Currier, De Lorme (Provencher), Dunkin, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gibbs, Grant, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Howe, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson [Terrebonne], McKeagney, McMillan, Moffat, Morris, Morison (Niagara), Pope, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Shanly, Simard, Sproat, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Webb, and Wright (Ottawa County).—44.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Baker, Béchard, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Brousseau, Brown Burpee, Bowell, Cameron (Peel), Campbell, Cayley, Cheval, Cimon, Coupal, Delorme, [St. Hyacinthe], Drew, Dufresne, Ferguson, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Gendron, Gray, Holton, Huntington, Hurdon, Jackson, Keefer, Lapum, Lawson, Little, MacDonald [Glengarry], McDonald (Antigonish), Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall, [Lanark], McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison [Victoria, O.], Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pouliot, Pozer, Ray, Ross [Dundas], Ross (Prince Edward), Ross [Victoria, N. S.], Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Scatcherd, Snider, Stephenson, Stirton, Street, Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, White [East Hastings], Whitehead, Willson, Wood, York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—72.

INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. MILLS moved an address for correspondence in reference to public lands in

Ontario, about which no treaty of reservation to Indians prior to 1st July, 1867. He believed the Government had assumed the control of some unsundered lands, which should properly rest with the Local Government, and he desired to ascertain whether any correspondence had taken place.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said any correspondence there might be would be brought down. The Indian Department did not pretend to the control of any land that had not been properly surrendered.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURPEE moved for an Order of the House for list of persons appointed as employees of the House since April 1868. He said that at Confederation almost all the employees had been taken from the old Province of Canada, and a resolution had been at a previous session passed that each Province should be considered in the appointments. Complaints, however, had been made, and he believed that there were only seventeen or eighteen from the Lower Provinces in the employ of the House, and only three in the Senate. He thought the matter ought to be looked into and the evil remedied.—Carried.

APPOINTMENT TO DEPARTMENTS AT OTTAWA

Mr. BURPEE moved an address for copies of all Orders in Council since 1st July, 1867 under which any persons have been appointed to office in the Public Departments at Ottawa. He believed the Civil Service Act had been set aside by Orders in Council.—Carried.

CLERGY RESERVES.

Mr. BOWELL moved an address for a statement of lands set apart as Clergy Reserves out of 27,857 acres surrendered to the Crown by the Mohawk Indians in the Township of Tyendinaga, &c. He said that some of the lands had been sold and the money appropriated to other objects than the benefit of the Indians.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said there was no objection to the address but feared there would not be time to obtain the information this session.—Carried

MCGREEVY'S CLAIM.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved an order of the House for claims presented by Mr. McGreevy, contractor for Parliament Buildings.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON suggested that there should be an evening session, so that the

Prorogation might take place on Wednesday.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER said he had already stated when moving that the House should sit from 1 to 6 that he and his colleagues were engaged in the evening.

Mr. MACDONALD said the House should not be adjourned for any private engagement of any class of people in the House.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said it was rare that the House had ever sat at all, and the engagement had been constructed under that circumstance.

DR. DAW'S CLAIM.

Mr. OLIVER moved an address for a claim made by Dr. Daws for medical services rendered to the late Private B. Sifton. He desired to ask whether this claim would be paid by the Government, and if so, when? as great delay had occurred already.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he had at present no recollection of the claim, but if there had been delay, it must have been unavoidable, but full information would be laid before the House after enquiry.

Mr. OLIVER explained the circumstances of the case, and said such delay as had occurred should not have taken place.—Carried.

RAILWAY ACT.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the House into Committee on Bill 31, an Act to amend the Railway Act, 1868, in which are inserted certain provisions of the Bill to amend the Railway Act of 1868, and of the Bill (No. 8) to amend "the Railway Act of 1861," and to extend the same, (as amended by Standing Committee on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines), Mr. MILLS in the Chair.

The Bill passed through Committee, to be read a third time to-morrow.

STAMP DUTIES.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. MORRIS, the House went into Committee on Bill No. 29, an Act to remove doubts as to the liability of Stamp Duties of Premium Notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.

The Bill passed through Committee, and was finally passed.

LANDS IN MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL, on moving the further consideration of the proposed motion that the House do now re-

solve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on which to found an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying for the issue of amended regulations for the survey, distribution, settlement, and sale of lands in the Province of Manitoba, said he understood on the previous discussion that the Government assented to the principles of his resolutions, and, if this were so, he would not press the matter. He thought a title ought to be given to lands on a residence of three years, and that some reduction should be made in the price of the lands. As to the administration of oaths he thought his objection had been acceded to as correct.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS admitted the latter point, but said there was no reason for a reduction of price.

Order discharged.

Mr. FERGUSON referred to the distribution of the lands to the half-breeds in the North West, and thought some condition of settlement should be imposed.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said the intention of the law would be carried out, but it was impossible to have stated rules, as some might be mere children and others men. As to the settlement duties, the matter was premature, but would be considered subsequently. The Government was dealing most liberally in the matter of the lands, as shown by the appropriation to the half breeds, and the offer to the Volunteers. The Lieut. Governor was authorized to select the most suitable lands for the half breeds, and when the time for possession it would be time enough to consider conditions of settlement, and he was sure that the hon. member would believe that the Government would act in good faith in the matter.

Mr. BLAKE pointed out that the effect of the regulations was that the half breeds were entitled to the lands without any conditions of settlement at all.

Mr. FERGUSON said he could not accept the statement of the Minister of Militia. He was in favour of settlement conditions, and was sorry that the matter was left so entirely in the hands of the Local Government. He should move a proposition that the conditions of settlement on these Indian lands should be the same as those imposed in the case of pre-emption and homestead rights.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member for Lanark had done good service to the public interests in bringing in those resolutions. The Government entirely agreed with the view taken by that hon. member respecting criminal law

Hon. Mr. Macdougall

in Manitoba. The suggestion with regard to the public roads was a local matter which had escaped the attention of the Government, but they would give it full consideration. He hoped the hon. member for Cardwell would trust the Government that they had a desire to deal fairly, and impartially with the people of the North West.

Dr. SCHULTZ regretted that the hon. member for Cardwell had taken exception to the appropriation of lands for the half-breeds. If it were given to them on any but the present terms, it would be practically useless to them. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw his motion. If land were to be sold at all (and he was opposed to making lands a source of revenue) he thought \$1 per acre was little enough for it (hear, hear).

The House adjourned at six o'clock till one o'clock to-morrow (Tuesday) afternoon.

THE SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 11, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

THE INTERCOLONIAL R. R.

Pursuant to the Order of the Day, the House proceeded to the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into, and report on all matters connected with the survey, location and construction of the Intercolonial Railway since the appointment of the Commissioners, and the said Report being again read by the Clerk,

Hon. Mr. McLELAN said that the report of the Commissioners had been prepared early in the Session for the purpose of being submitted to Parliament, but after the House of Commons had met, a number of returns had been asked for, it was then expected that the report would be printed with the returns and immediately presented to both branches, but the House of Commons decided that they should be at once sent to the Committee on Public Accounts, where they had undergone a thorough investigation. It was then intimated to that Committee that there was also a Committee of the Senate which was engaged in a similar investigation, and the papers were accordingly also submitted to that Committee. The report stated that the whole line had been put under contract. The total amount of contracts for the work, which included the whole

road with the exception of the superstructure, rails, ties, and rolling stock was \$9,692,791, the purchase of western extension not being included. The progress of construction was exceedingly satisfactory, and had been considerably assisted by the thorough nature of the surveys. The evidence adduced before the Committee went to show that the cost of surveys in other countries had been far greater than in the case of the Intercolonial; and to prove this Mr. McLelan read from reports of American Engineers, which showed that the cost of engineering on various American lines ranged from \$1,633 to \$3,364 a mile. The evidence of Mr. Fleming and Mr. Shanly also showed that a great saving was effected in the construction of railways, when the surveys were perfect. In consequence of their unsatisfactory character in the case of the Pacific Railway, some \$2,000,000 had been required to rectify errors. Since the Intercolonial had been located, the expenses of engineering had been largely reduced. From this time henceforth the staff are required to furnish their own supplies, and the reduction in the number has effected a saving in salaries of \$38,000 annually. The location of the road was the most advantageous that could be made. The evidence taken before the Committee, proved that the departure of the line from the Major Robinson route and its deviation in the direction of Newcastle had taken it through a well settled country, shortened the distance some 12 miles, and finally brought it to tide water, where it was available for vessels of 1000 tons. As respects the Western extension, the evidence before the Committee showed that the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had entered into an agreement with a company in England to build a road from Moncton to Truro, upon a line chosen by the Governments, and with the distinct understanding, that should the Intercolonial Railway be built, the former was to be a part of it. Under these circumstances it was obvious that had the route been taken as recommended by Mr. Fleming, faith would have been broken with the Company, and a rival line would have been established.

The Engineer of the line had stated that it had actually cost some \$300,000 more than the company had received for it—something like \$900,000. The Commissioners had made the valuation of the lands irrespective of any enhanced value that might be placed on them on account of the passage of the railway; and he knew himself that land had risen in the neighbourhood one hundred per cent. in value. It was distinctly stated before the Committee that the location of the work-

shops at Moncton was proper, and the representative of the County had said that the price paid was reasonable and moderate. In reference to the purchase of cars he explained that had all of them been taken as tendered by the Montreal and Toronto firms, the Commissioners would have been obliged to ship them from River du Loup to Nova Scotia, and they would consequently have cost more than those purchased in Halifax. As respects the locomotives tenders were asked for, and among those sent in was one from a gentleman residing in the Dominion who had no workshops or machinery for the construction of locomotives. He tendered for twenty engines and also on behalf of an English Company at a sum considerably less than his own offer. It was evident to the Commissioners that he was interested in both tenders, and the same game that had been played in the case of the sections might be repeated. Supposing he received the lowest tender, then he might fail and fall back on the highest. It was also believed that the English Company making the lowest tender were not able to complete their contract, and finally the contracts were given to Companies in Glasgow, Kingston and Halifax. On the question of steel rails, Mr. McLelan read from various authorities to show that they were cheaper in the end—the breakages are less and greater security is ensured. In the case of bridges, it was seen after investigation that in many parts of the country wood would have to be carried a long distance at a considerable cost, and this fact taken in connection with the saving in masonry and the greater durability of iron, decided the Commissioners to build those structures of that material, whenever they are over 60 feet span. In conclusion, Mr. McLelan stated that the cost of the railway would be, in all probability, from \$5,000 to \$10,000 less per mile than the average cost of railways in the United States and would not be exceeded by any in respect to durability and security.

Hon. Mr. WARK was not disposed to enter into the discussion of the important subjects opened up by the hon. gentleman at that late stage in the session; but an opportunity would probably occur hereafter when he could debate the question. As respects the cost of engineering, however, four-fifths of the railway had yet to be built and it was impossible to make comparison of the expense which could be considered reliable.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said this was a subject upon which he naturally felt a deep interest, and was called upon to make some observations in reply to the hon. gentleman from Kent. That gentleman

did not put the matter fully to the House when he charged against engineering expenses upon the Intercolonial, when comparing it with other lines, the whole cost which had been incurred in former years. The cases were entirely different. Those American lines which had been quoted showed merely the necessary outlay in locating each of these particular lines, while the outlay that had been incurred for many years past, and which it was now contemplated by the argument of the hon. gentleman, to charge against the engineering cost of the line, could not fairly be so charged, as a large portion of this expense in the past nine years had been incurred not in engineering expeditions connected with the location of the *present route of that work*, but in endeavouring to meet the demand from a large portion of the public, as well of New Brunswick as of Canada, to find a shorter, and, if possible, a better route on the Western side of the Province of New Brunswick.

An examination of the ten or twelve trial routes which caused this expense, most of them from one to two hundred miles distant from the present line, will account for the expenses to which the hon. gentleman refers; but he could scarcely imagine that any person who wished to deal fairly could attempt to charge against the engineering expenses of the present route for the purpose of making out a case against the Government and their officers the expenditure of the last nine years upon the various trial lines to which he referred, all of which had to be allowed, and the expenditure for which had nothing to do with the construction of the road on the present route.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST JUST.—The engineer who was sent had instructions to find the best route.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—In 1867, when the construction of the Intercolonial Railway became a part of the law of the land, much agitation existed with respect to the route, and the Government, as a matter of fair play, assented to the urgent call of the Western and Southern sections of New Brunswick to make surveys of the different lines which were alleged to exist in New Brunswick.

The surveys were made and line after line was run largely inspired by sectional interests, but professedly to obtain the shortest route.

Hon. gentlemen would therefore find that when the surveying expenses charged against construction were counted up those surveys would make a considerable item in the total amount. Thus much in reply to the charges of the hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. Wark), who has spent the past

two years in trying to show the mistakes and extravagance of the Government in connection with this great public work.

He would now notice some statements in connection with this railway, made by a gentleman who occupied a prominent position in this country, and to whom was generally conceded the leadership of the Opposition. That gentleman had, in the course of his perambulations in the West, frequently referred to the Intercolonial Railway, both in reference to its location and construction, in no measured terms of condemnation; he condemned the selection of the route though it was the same route that he in the great Confederation debate in 1856, pronounced as the one that should be chosen. He stated that the \$20,000,000, which he alleges it will cost, as "*so much money thrown into the sea*," and, doubtless, if he possessed the power, notwithstanding that it was the condition of our Union, the further construction of this road would be stopped and the hopes of the Maritime Provinces disappointed; that gentlemen further stated, as I am informed, that many deviations had been made from the route surveyed by Major Robinson, and that notably one at Newcastle had been made to suit the interests of a member of the Government, and "in order to take it through Mr. Mitchell's ship-yard," that to do this a good line of road through a fertile valley had been abandoned and the line taken away from the settlements and lengthened several miles.

At this stage of the debate Hon. Mr. SANBORN, supported by Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST, raised a question of order, that the hon. gentleman had no right to refer to a member of another branch of the Legislature, nor to statements made by such person.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL contended that he had violated no rule of the House, he did not refer to what had taken place in the other branch, but to the utterances of the leader of the Opposition at his political meetings in the West, and that the Government, as well as himself, had been misrepresented by the gentleman referred to, he had a right, and Parliament was the proper place to give such explanations as he deemed necessary.

The SPEAKER decided that Mr. Mitchell had violated no rule of the House, and had a perfect right to make his explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL in resuming, said that he could quite understand the desire which had been evinced by the gentlemen of the Opposition to prevent his explanation. The charges referred to had gone to the country and though they were untrue

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

they would doubtless be believed until they were contradicted, and if in this side-winded way, by raising the question of order, they could have prevented his explanations, their object would have been accomplished.

He then went on to say that it would be manifestly unfair were he not allowed to answer the unfounded charges that had been circulated broadcast over the country.

Now he would say in all sincerity that it had always been his desire in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, to see it located with a view to the best interests of the country. He believed the line adopted was really the best, and he was proud to say that he had contributed somewhat by his personal exertions, by his pen and otherwise, to enlighten the people of the Dominion in reference to the merits of the route which had been adopted.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST—Were these also Mr. Tilley's views?

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—They were his own views, the views of the Cabinet of which he was a member, and were the views which Parliament endorsed.

He would state that it was not true that the line had been changed at Newcastle to suit his individual interests thereby, and to take it through his ship-yard as had been alleged. The facts were these, that Major Robinson's line was not a located line, but mainly an exploratory one, and in adopting it as the general character of the route to be taken, it never was intended that no changes or deviations should be made therefrom when the public interests could be served thereby, and very many and important deviations were made, but only when the public interests were served, as appears by the evidence of Mr. Fleming and Mr. Shanly and others taken before the Committee on Banking and Commerce of the House of Commons this present Session, of which Mr. Mackenzie was a member.

In answer to question No. 2, put by Mr. Holton, Mr. Fleming replied:—

Explain, if you please, the nature and extent of the deviations from the original line, and the considerations which led to their adoption?—Material deviations have been made from the original Major Robinson Line, as laid down on the maps, although the general route has been adhered to. Between Rivière du Loup and Metapedia there is scarcely a mile of the line the same. These deviations were made in order to lessen the cost of construction. It would have been enormously expensive to have built the railway precisely on the original line. Between Metapedia and Bathurst the original line has not been

widely departed from. Between Bathurst and Moncton the line has been straightened some ten or twelve miles and brought nearer the centres of population. Between Moncton and Truro the line as located is generally at some distance from the original line; one great object of the deviation has been to pass through the coal and iron districts of Nova Scotia, with the view of assisting in the development of the mineral resources of the country.

In answer to Mr. McKenzie, he said:—

Mr. Mackenzie.—From Bathurst to Moncton there are really no engineering difficulties, excepting the passages of the Miramichi River, which is not very difficult. I would ask Mr. Fleming what is the nature of the country between Bathurst and Moncton from an engineering point of view?—Very simple apart from its wooded character.

The trees would be cleared away, I suppose?—It is densely wooded; but when the wood is taken away it is level generally.

In reference to the deviation from Bathurst to the crossing at Miramichi, Mr. Fleming further says:—

Mr. Mackenzie—Will you say whether the original line run by Major Robinson by the Nipisiguit Valley, and down the west Branch of the Miramichi River, presents greater engineering difficulties, or greater cost of construction than the route ultimately adopted between Newcastle and Bathurst?—I can hardly answer that. We made an exploration but no line was begun.

Did you never follow the line that he had drawn to ascertain the accuracy of his statement? Because he states distinctly (and I cannot see how he could have made it without surveying the line), that there is no portion of it where the grade exceeds 25 feet per mile?—He speaks of average grades and not of particular grades.

I am quite sure that he says no grade there exceeds 25 feet per mile?—I am sure he speaks of average grades.

Have you ever examined the route yourself?—No.

What is the grade upon the route adopted between Newcastle and Bathurst?—One in a hundred—52.80 in the mile is the maximum.

Did it not occur to you, from the statements made by Major Robinson, that it would have been wise to have followed his line?—No; I found that in other sections of the country, the grades given on his profiles and other information did not agree with the ground. I do not mean to infer that there were any inaccuracies in his reports on plans. They were all they professed to be, simply to show that there were no insuperable difficulties on the

route. They were not very accurate or very detailed surveys, but they were correct as far as they went.

Mr. Mackenzie—In crossing so high up the river, could you not cross easier than at the Forks?—I think I could. I think the actual crossing would be somewhat less.

Mr. Walsh,—At that point?—At Indian Town.

Are you aware that in Major Robinson's report he gives the estimate of crossing at Indian Town?—Yes, but that report was made some years ago, when it was the thought necessary to have very flat curves, &c., at Metepediac, where he calculated on building sixteen very long bridges; we find it necessary to have only two bridges. I do not attach much importance to this estimate.

I suppose the width of the Miramichi River has not varied much since Major Robinson surveyed the line. He gives it as something like 2,300 feet, at all events, 300 feet more than the actual length of the bridges at Newcastle.

Mr. Mackenzie.—Was it necessary to make this divergence at Newcastle?—Yes; there was a very great necessity for it. The ground is at one place high, and at another low, and we had to go down the side of the hill very gradually.

The highest point is where the line is actually located?—We took the lowest ground we could find, and made a great many different surveys in that direction in order to find it. We selected the line which gave us the best railway, from an engineering point of view.

In reply to a question by Mr. Lawson as to the distance that was saved by crossing the forks of the river near Newcastle in place of 16 miles higher up at Indian Town, where Major Robinson proposed the crossing, Mr. Fleury says:

Mr. Lawson—Would it have increased the length of the line to have brought it by Indian Town? Yes, it would have increased it about ten or twelve miles.

Mr. Mackenzie—Here is your answer. Mr. Fleming, and I am quite sure that it conveys an erroneous impression. You say, "Between Bathurst and Moncton the line has been straightened some ten or twelve miles, and brought nearer to the centre of population?"—Yes.

Upon the same point Mr. Walter Shanly, M. P., in reply to questions says:

Hon. Dr. Tupper—(Pointing to map)—Between that point (Bathurst) and that (Moncton), is it desirable to save eight or ten miles, and at the same time come nearer the centres of population and the sea coast?—Of course.

Mr. Mackenzie—But, supposing the grade on this line turns out to be 100 feet

per mile and passing through a barren country, while the other line passes through a country that can be cultivated, and no part of the road having a grade of more than 25 feet to the mile. Now, considering these facts (and I get them from official reports), do you consider it advisable to go through this barren tract instead of going the other way?—Under those conditions I would prefer the line having the better grade and better commercial prospects.

Hon. Mr. Holton—Other conditions being the same, the shorter line is better than the longer?—Certainly.

The Chairman—Do you not think it a commercial advantage to get to tide water?

Mr. Mackenzie remarked,—But it does not reach tide water.

Mr. Fleming further examined.

Hon. Dr. Tupper—How near can vessels come to the line?—Half a mile for a vessel of 800 tons. I might almost say 1,000 tons.

I would ask whether the Intercolonial Railway grade on that portion of the line is objectionable?—Not at all. I have already stated that there is no engineering difficulty between Bathurst and Moncton, except the bridging.

Mr. Mackenzie—Yes, but fifty feet to the mile is a high grade?—Not at all. It is higher at other points than that.

Hon. Mr. Holton—How much higher by the line ultimately chosen than by the other?—I cannot tell. It is quite possible that the grade is a true one, but I found generally that the grades given by Major Robinson were average grades, not individual grades.

Mr. Mackenzie—My recollection is very distinct that he states twenty-five feet to be the maximum? It may be that an easier line could be had at Indian Town to Bathurst. I do not say it could not be had; but the line from Indian Town to Bay Verte could not be easier than the one from Newcastle to Moncton.

You have surmounted the highest part of that land and the grades are necessarily high? Yes, but we escaped some very deep valleys.

Mr. MITCHELL then stated that he thought that the evidence thus adduced before a Committee of which Mr. Mackenzie was a member ought to have satisfied that gentleman that he was wrong in the statements ascribed to him, that the change of the line had lengthened it from 10 to 11 miles, and to the same extent increased the cost, and the evidence which is now adduced, and which he himself, as a member of the Committee, obtained, must have satisfied him that he made a mis statement, and he should have corrected it; but he had waited in vain for

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

such a correction, and he now indignantly repelled the imputation which several of that gentleman's speeches contains, that the divergence of the line was made in his (Mr. Mitchell's) interest, and for the purpose of enhancing the value of his property and taking it through his shipyard. Mr. M. further stated that such divergence, which is ascribed to those influences, *shortens the line from 10 to 12 miles*, and lessens the expenses to the same proportionate extent. That gentleman was also wrong in stating that the divergence referred to removed the location of the line from a fertile valley, away from population and business, and, took it through a barren wilderness unfit for settlement.

Mr. Mackenzie in speaking thus was not well informed and did not state the facts. The original location of Major Robinson between Bathurst and Miramichi was some twelve to fifteen miles further into the interior, and hence further from population and settlement than the present location, and through land for half its length much the same in character as the former, but, if anything poorer than the present line, while the latter, for the balance of the distance, was through better land than the former, and approaches the Miramichi in close proximity to the only towns or villages upon it, where the centre of trade and populations exists, and in close proximity to sea navigation. This latter point which Mr. Mackenzie did not consider worthy of notice, Mr. Mitchell deemed of vast importance to the future trade of the place, and when it passed the town of Newcastle two miles below the crossing of the Miramichi River, it was within a quarter of a mile of ocean navigation, which was fit to float the Allan line of steamers. Had the line crossed at Indian Town, 16 miles further up, as Major Robinson proposed, it would have been that distance further away from sea navigation, and it would have been comparatively needless for the promotion of our Fisheries or the commerce of our vast sea coasts. Mr. Mitchell further stated that in the whole distance from Riviere du Loup to Halifax there were but two points where the Intercolonial Railway touched ports suitable as feeders for the trans-oceanic trade, viz: Restigouche and Miramichi; and it was of vast importance to the future of the road, and to the prosperity and trade of northern New Brunswick, that these points should be made available, and so far from the Government or himself being subject to censure for such a change, he felt satisfied that Parliament and the country only required to know the facts to

appreciate fully the advantages which that change of location afforded. In other parts of the road changes had been effected with advantage. On the Metapedia, for instance, Major Robinson lays down 12 bridges as required on passing through the Valley, thus crossing the stream 12 times, while Mr. Fleming succeeded in passing it with but only two crossings. He stated that he was satisfied that Mr. Mackenzie's general charges against the Government were as unfounded as in the particular instances which he had so satisfactorily answered. He was well acquainted with the country and its resources, and he had no hesitation in saying that the line was located in the right place; that the money which it cost would not be thrown into the sea, but would be of vast utility in extending the operations in our immense fisheries, valued at \$15,000,000 per annum, in developing our lumber regions and in settling our agricultural lands, drawing population to our shores, and generally in enhancing the value of lands and property in that extensive region through which it passed. It had been made a charge against him that he owned lands in Newcastle, which would be enhanced in value by the construction of the road. This he admitted was true, he was the owner of land which would be enhanced in value as any other lands in the vicinity would be enhanced, but he did not think that any one could fairly point to that as a ground of censure. He had for the past seventeen years taken a prominent part in the advocacy of this great public work, not as a matter of local or personal, but a general and public interest, and while he frankly avows the advantages the railway would give to property, he indignantly repudiated the charge that he had in any way influenced the direction or location of the road, from personal motives or interest, and thought it unworthy of a prominent public man thus to defame another in his absence as had been done by the gentleman referred to. He regretted exceedingly, he went on to say, that he was not present when the unjustifiable charges to which he referred had been made against him, for he would have immediately given a reply which would have prevented them being circulated so freely. He had never been influenced by personal motives in the course of his public career. For seventeen or eighteen years ago he had stood up time and again, and assumed the same position he did that day with regard to the location of the railway, and he was proud to find that his action had been endorsed by the Parliament of the Dominion and was

supported by public opinion. This route took the railway through a greater quantity of good land than it had gone through the valley of the North West. The traffic that would ere long be created in fresh fish, especially in Salmon, would be very large—one establishment at present on the Bay of Chaleur shipped a large quantity of fresh salmon in ice by schooners to the American market. When the railway was completed, dozens of such establishments would start up and find the business lucrative, since the cost of transportation would be insignificant, compared with what it is now. None could presume for a moment to argue that the line was not decidedly the best that could have been adopted. He could certainly say that he had never yet heard a substantial argument to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST regretted that no information had been given to show that the gauge adopted was the best.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL said that the question of gauge had received the careful consideration of the Government, and after obtaining the best information possible they had adopted the 5 feet 6 inches as against the 4 feet 8½ inches. The alteration of the gauge under existing circumstances would involve the sacrifice of a large amount of rolling stock now in use on the Government lines in the Maritime Provinces. Nor was it to be expected that the Grand Trunk could alter their gauge to please us.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD was in favour of the narrow gauge.

The report was adopted.

Some ordinary business was then transacted, and the House adjourned at six.

On resuming at eight o'clock, the House passed several Bills and then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th April, 1871.

The House met at one o'clock.
After routine.

THE CENSUS.

Hon. Sir A. T. Galt asked what means had been adopted to ensure accuracy in taking the Census. The impression was gaining ground that it was not being taken properly, as the schedules were not yet distributed.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said the Census was not to be taken by schedules left at peoples' houses, but by enumerators. It was

Hon. Mr. Mitchell.

therefore, unimportant whether the schedules were distributed or not, they were merely to give people information as to what questions they would be expected to answer. There would be three thousand enumerators employed some three or four weeks in taking the Census; they were now at work and so far as we could learn, were doing their business very thoroughly though not as fast as he had expected they would.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said that as he had never been consulted as to the appointment of enumerators in his own constituency, he would not be responsible for any errors that might appear in the reports from Glengarry.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT regretted that arrangements had not been made to have the entire Census taken on one day. It was the only means by which an accurate Census could be taken.

The subject was dropped.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

The following bills were read a third time and passed.

An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec (as amended by Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.)—Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS.

An Act to provide additional facilities for the deposit of savings at interest with the security of the Government; and for the issue and redemption of Dominion Notes.—Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

On motion that the House go into Committee on an Act respecting Weights and Measures.

Hon. Mr. HOLYON hoped the Bill would not be pressed at this late hour of the session. It should have been sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce in the first place.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the hon. member could not have perused the Bill with his usual care, if he had he would have seen that its object was simply to consolidate existing laws respecting Weights and Measures, and to provide, what was at present entirely wanting, a satisfactory system of inspection.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Mr. BLANCHET in the chair.

Mr. MILLS called the attention of the House to the fact that some of the provisions of the measure trench on the municipal rights of the Local Legislatures.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD suggested that

the standard weight of a bushel of oats should be 32 lbs., as in the United States.

After some discussion in Committee the suggestion was adopted.

The Committee rose and reported the bill with amendments.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN objected to the bill as a measure for the creation of a fresh army of officials throughout the Dominion.

Mr. KILLAM advocated uniformity in the Weights and Measures of the Dominion. He regretted that the Government had not seen fit to adopt the bushel measure instead of continuing the *minot* at present in use there.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

The House went into Committee on the Act to render permissive the use of the metric system of Weights and Measures, Hon. Mr. BLANCHET in the chair.

Mr. D. A. MACDONALD confessed his ignorance of the bill, and asked for explanation, if any member in the House (including the promoter of the Bill) knew anything more about it.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the system was being adopted throughout Europe, and the object of the Bill was to permit its introduction into this country.

The Bill was reported without amendments, read a third time and passed.

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1868, and to alter the duties of Excise chargeable in the Province of Manitoba. (Resolution adopted on 6th April, referred.) Hon. Mr. MORRIS—was passed through Committee.

On motion for a third reading Mr. D. A. MACDONALD said he had but one objection to the measure, it was going to make liquor cheaper in that Province than in any other part of the Dominion. He believed that every precaution should be taken against allowing the sale of whiskey to the Indians and Half-breeds, and to accomplish this object, a prohibitory law should be enacted.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that perhaps some arrangements might be come to with the Local Government, to increase the amount of duty on importations of liquor into Manitoba. This Government had power to impose only 25 cts. per gallon, on whiskey introduced there.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Glengarry, and would like to see a Maine law passed in the new Province.

Mr. D. A. SMITH thought it would be exceedingly beneficial to the North-West country if intoxicating liquors could be excluded from it altogether. He believed the Legislature of Manitoba would very

readily consent to an increase of duty on imported liquors.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN suggested that as it was too late in the session to make the alteration in the amount of duty, that the Government should be empowered to raise the duty to as high a rate as they might think was necessary to check the importation of intoxicating liquors into the North West Territory.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS adopted the suggestion of the Hon. member for Gloucester, and a clause to that effect was inserted in the Bill.

The Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

The Act to amend the Act securing the independence of Parliament was passed through Committee, Mr. SCATCHERD in the chair.

On the motion for concurrence, Mr. BLAKE moved that the bill be re-committed with instructions to provide that after the dissolution of the present Parliament, no paid Commissioner of the Intercolonial Railway shall be eligible as a member of this House.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said that the only reason why a member of this House had been appointed to the office, was in order to give the House an opportunity to put questions directly to the commission during the construction of the Railway, and to leave one of the commissioners present to reply on their behalf. This Parliament would not be dissolved for two years yet, and he hoped before 1873 to be able to take a pleasure trip to Halifax *via* the Intercolonial Railway, (hear, hear.) It would, therefore, be his duty to oppose the motion of the hon. member for West Durham.

A division was then taken on the motion which was lost: Yeas 54, Nays 71.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Barthe, Benoit, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bourassa, Bowman, Burpee, Cheval, Crawford [Brockville], Delorme, (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Ferris, Fournier, Galt [Sir Alexander T.], Geoffrion, Holton, Huntington, Jones, [Leeds and Grenville], Killam, Little, Macdonald, (Glengarry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, Masson [Soulanges], McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morison (Victoria, O.), Munroe, Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pickard, Pouliot, Pozer, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross [Wellington, C. R.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton] Whitehead, Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.], and Young.—54.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Beaty, Bellerose, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Burton, Cameron

[Inverness], Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Cimon, Costigan, Currier, Daoust, Delorme [Provencher], Dobbie, Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Gray, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald [Middlesex], Masson, [Terrebonne], McDougall (Three Rivers), McMillan, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Renaud, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Victoria N. S.), Savary, Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Smith [Selkirk], Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Webb, White (East Hastings), Wilson and Wright (Ottawa County).—71.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BLAKE moved that after the dissolution of the present Parliament, no person holding any employment of profit in the service of the Government of any of the Provinces of the Dominion, such as sheriff, registrar, prothonotary, &c., shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the same reason that prevented the Government from accepting such an amendment two years ago, still existed. The Government ought to be free to employ whoever they might like. It was for the Local Legislature of each Province to create laws to meet such cases, and not for this House.

Mr. BLAKE said the remarks of the Minister of Militia, were based entirely on a mis-conception of the functions of the Local Legislatures. The view to be taken of it was this:—Were these men likely to be independent here? Were they or were they not likely to be influenced by the Local Governments? Were they or were they not in a position as servants of the Local Government, to discharge their duties impartially in this House? That was the view and the only view to be taken of it.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER contended that the Local Legislatures alone had a right to deal with the question.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the Hon. Minister of Militia was well aware that he (Sir Geo.) practically controlled the appointments in the Province of Quebec.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—No, no.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON simply desired to see the same men excluded from this Parliament that were excluded from the Parliament of the old Province of Canada.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN denied that the Min-

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

ister of Militia controlled the appointments of the Local Legislature of Quebec. There was no earthly reason why this motion should be passed, because the Local Legislatures would take good care to prevent their servants from sitting in this House, knowing that the moment they did so, the servant became too powerful to be controlled by their masters.

Mr. MACKENZIE cited cases in which influence had been exercised over members of this House, through the absence of some such provision as that contained in the motion before the House. No harm could result from carrying this resolution and no good argument had been adduced to show that it should not be incorporated in the bill.

Hon. JOS. HOWE said he had seen gentlemen in this House pressed by other than Government influences. In his own Province he had never employed the Government patronage to exercise undue influence. But the money which he had obtained for Nova Scotia by his compromise with the Government, had been so expended by the Local Government of Nova Scotia as not to throw a single dollar into the hands of his supporters. There was wholesale bribery, far worse than anything which could be pointed to in this House.

A division was then taken on the motion which was lost; Yeas 56, Nays 71.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Barthe, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Brousseau, Burpee, Cheval, Cimon, Currier, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dobbie, Dorion, Ferris, Fortier, Fournier, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Geoffrion, Godin, Grant, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Little, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McMonies, Metcalfe, Mills, Morrison [Victoria O.], Munroe, Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Ross [Dundas], Ross [Prince Edward], Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Ryan [King's N. B.], Rymal, Scatcherd, Snider, Stirton, Thompson [Ontario], Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White [Halton], Whitehead, Wright [Ottawa County], Wright [York, Ontario, W. R.] and Young—56.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Beaty, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Burton, Cameron [Inverness], Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.], Costigan, Daoust, Delorme [Provencher], Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Gray, Grover, Hincks [Sir Francis], Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald [Antigonish], McDonald [Lunenburg], McDonald (Middlesex), Masson [Soulanges], Masson

[Terrebonne], McDougall [Lanark], McDougall [Three Rivers], McMillan, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Savary, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (East Hastings), and Willson.—71.

Mr. BLAKE moved that after the dissolution of the present Parliament, no Minister of the Crown in any of the Provincial Governments shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons.

Lost—Yeas 59, Nays 72.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Ault, Barthe, Blake, Bodwell, Bolton, Bowman, Brouseau, Burpee, Cheval, Cimon, Crawford (Brockville), Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Ferris, Forbes, Fortier, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Killam, Little, Macdonald (Glengarry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, Masson (Soulanges), McConkey, McMonies, Meicalfe, Mills, Morison (Victoria O.), Munroe, Oliver, Pâquet, Pelletier, Pozer, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria N. S.), Ross (Wellington C. R.), Ryan (King's N. B.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Snider, Stirton, Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Whitehead, Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—59.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Baker, Beaty, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brown, Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Costigan, Daoust, Delorme (Provencher), Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hincks (Sir Francis), Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Macdonald (Lunenburg), Macdonald (Middlesex), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Moffatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Savary, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, Willson and Wright (Ottawa County).—72.

The bill was then read a third time and passed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the House into Committee on the Act to make further provision for the Government of the North West Territories (from the Senate).

Mr. SCATCHERD in the chair.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER explained

that this was the temporary measure which was passed some two years ago, and which the Government now desired to re-enact.

Hon Mr. MACDOUGALL thought they should wait until they obtained the news of the Local Government.

Dr. SCHULTZ concurred in the views of the member for North Lanark, and thought until communication was opened, the powers of the Lieutenant Governor should not be limited in this matter.

The Bill then passed through Committee was reported, and the third reading moved.

Mr. MILLS said in the interest of emigrants the Laws of Settlement, should be amended so that no person demeaning himself peaceable or in an orderly manner shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or religious sentiments, and that the estates of persons dying intestate shall be distributed among their descendants.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the reason the Government resisted the motion was that it was untimely, as almost all the Country was in the possession of the Indians. The matter was in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor and his Council and the less interference there was the better.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) thought it would be very impolitic to legislate on this subject just now.

Mr. BLAKE said there was already a law on this subject; now the question was, what law was the best.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said it would be much better to leave the matter to the Local Government.

The motion was declared lost on a Division and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAWS IN MANITOBA.

The House went into Committee Mr. SCATCHERD in the Chair, on Bill (No. 58) An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion (from Senate).

Mr. MACDONALD called attention to the "provisions for the trials of any crimes to be committed, and the repeal of the former laws, shewing that the act took away the authority to try any offences that had occurred before the passing of the Act.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said there was already a Recorder's Court which would have to try Criminal Cases, and this act was merely to take the place of the existing

law, but that court would still have its full force.

Mr. MACDONALD asked whether any offence committed before the Act could be tried by the Court to be established.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said certainly it could, under the Criminal Laws existing at the time of the committal of the crime.

Mr. BLAKE said the Act could not bear the construction put upon it by the Minister of Militia, and the Government though competent to provide the Criminal Law had no power to govern the jurisdiction of the Court which the Act really did. It was necessary the Court should have power to try past offences, and he thought the Act should be amended so as simply to introduce the Criminal Law.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said it was certainly not the intention to organize a Court, and he quite agreed with the constitutional argument of the Hon. Member for West Durham. He would consider the wording of the Act so as to alter it to meet the real intention.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said there were other clauses which would have to be considered, for instance those relating to the Juries and the language of defence.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCES.

The House went into Committee, Mr. SCATCHERD in the chair.

To consider certain Resolutions for an Address to Her Majesty on the subject of the draft of a Bill intended for submission to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of removing doubts which may have been entertained respecting the powers of the Parliament of Canada, to establish the Provinces in Territories admitted, or which may hereafter be admitted into the Dominion of Canada, and to provide for the representation of such Provinces in the said Parliament, and vesting such powers in the said Parliament.

Hon Sir GEO. E. CARTIER promised to consider a suggestion of Mr. Mills as to the Laws on Elections and the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that the House should go into Committee to consider the following Resolution:

Resolved, that the Railway referred to in the Address to Her Majesty concerning the Union of British Columbia with Canada, adopted by this House on Saturday the 1st

Hon. Sir Geo. E. Cartier.

April instant, should be constructed and worked by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government; and that the public aid to be given to secure that undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy of money, or other aid, not unduly pressing on the industry and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the motion as out of order, the House having already considered a similar Resolution moved by the member for Sherbrooke.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the proposition he submitted was different from that of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, but even if it were not different, it could not be considered in its present form to-day. The motion of the member for Sherbrooke affected the second reading of the Bill, but the present was a distinct proposition. He pointed out the particulars in which he considered the two propositions differed.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT thought the motions were so identical that he should have to vote for the present one; but he thought under the circumstances the motion was in order and should be considered.

Mr. ANGLIN said he thought the resolution was something in the nature of a declaratory act, modifying the measure previously passed on the subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE maintained that the resolution was identical with the previous one, and had already been negatived.

After some further discussion,

The SPEAKER ruled the proposition in order, and said it would have been so at the present stage, had the two motions been alike, word for word.

The House then went into Committee, and reported the Resolution, which was read a first and second time.

Hon. Mr. DORION said he thought it would be unfair to mislead the people of British Columbia by admitting them on one condition and now passing a Resolution that that condition need be kept. The terms of Union pledged the construction of the Railway, but the present made it uncertain. He thought the matter should be made clear, and he therefore moved in amendment that the building of the Railway should be confined to the way mentioned in the Resolution, and that an Address should be presented to Her Majesty praying her to be pleased to consider the Resolution as part of the Address of the 1st April, and as one of the conditions of Union with British Columbia to be embodied in the Order in Council declaring the Union.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said the Address

having been passed, he could not vote for any addition, and the whole responsibility of the conditions contained in that Address rested with those who had carried it, and not with him.

The amendment was put and the vote resulted as follows: Yeas 42, Nays 79.

YEAS.—Messrs. Anglin, Bertrand, Blake, Bodwell, Bowman, Brown, Cheval, Cimon, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Drew, Fortier, Fournier, Geoffrion, Godin, Hagar, Holton, Huntington, Macdonald (Glenarry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, Mills, Morison (Victoria O.) Oliver, Paquet, Pelletier, Pouliot, Pozer, Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Stirton, Thompson (Ontario), Tremblay, Wallace, White (Halton), Whitehead, Wood, and Young.—42.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brousseau, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Currier, DeLorme (Provencher), Dobbie, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hincks (Sir Francis), Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Killam, Lacerte, Langevin, Lapum, Lawson, Little, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McMillan, Moffatt, Morris, Munroe, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria N. S.), Ryan (King's N. B.), Schultz, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Sproat, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (East Hastings), Willson, Wood, Wright (Ottawa County).—79.

Mr. TREMBLAY moved in amendment that the construction of the road should be entrusted to private companies, who should make the necessary disbursements, and receive as compensation such lands as the Government should judge convenient to grant along the line of route, or in the neighbourhood thereof.

The amendment was voted on as follows: Yeas 11, Nays 106.

YEAS.—Messrs. Cheval, Cimon, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Fortier, Fournier, Godin, Huntington, Pelletier, Pozer, and Tremblay.—11.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault, Ault, Baker, Barthe, Beaty, Bellerose, Benoit, Bertrand, Blake, Blanchet, Bodwell, Bowell, Bowman, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cartwright, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Currier, DeLorme (Provencher), Dobbie, Drew,

Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Fortin, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Gibbs, Grant, Gray, Grover, Hagar, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holton, Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Killam, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, Little, Macdonald (Glenarry), McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), McDonald (Middlesex), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Lanark), McDougall (Three Rivers), McMillan, Mills, Moffatt, Morris, Munroe, Oliver, Paquet, Perry, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pouliot, Ray, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington C. R.), Ryan (King's N. B.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Schultz, Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Sproat, Stephenson, Stirton, Street, Thompson (Ontario), Tilley, Tourangeau, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Willson, Wood, Wright (Ottawa County), and Young.—106.

The main motion was carried, and at a quarter past six the House rose till Eight o'clock.

AFTER RECESS,

BANKS AND BANKING.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the second reading of the amendments to the Bill relating to Banks and Banking. He explained that the amendments were not of such a nature as to interfere with the general principles or provisions of the Bill.

All the amendments, excepting the 3rd, were concurred in.

RAILWAY DRAWBRIDGES.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN moved the second reading of the Act to authorise the Governor in Council to exempt Railway Companies in certain cases from the obligation to build drawbridges over navigable rivers (from Senate). He explained that its object was to provide that bridges over navigable rivers should be constructed in such a way as not to interfere with the navigation of such river.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the Bill. It was a proposal to take the functions of Parliament out of the hands of this House, and as such should meet with their disapproval.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the whole proceeding was irregular, and if proceeded with at all, should at least be postponed till next session. If, as he suspected, the Bill was to give special powers to some railway company, it would be better for them to come before this House in the regular way as petitioners.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said this was no

special case, but a general measure. Under existing laws, the Local Legislatures could grant charters to Railways and permit them to construct drawbridges over navigable streams. This Bill proposed to give Government a surveillance over such matters so as to prevent railway companies or other corporations from interfering with the navigation of public water channels.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had no objection to the assenting to a second reading of the Bill, if the Government would send it to the Committee on Canals, Railways, and Telegraphs.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN had no objection to do so.

Mr. BLAKE said even under these circumstances, unless the Bill were very greatly modified in Committee, he would feel bound to oppose it. General measures were framed to meet general emergencies. It could not be said that such was the case in this instance, and he saw no good reason why this House should resign its privilege of dealing with these matters as they rose.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said a great many accidents had occurred through these draw-bridges, and it was proposed to compel companies to erect fixed bridges under which steamers could pass by lowering their smoke stacks. He admitted that the measure was somewhat irregular and he would like to have it referred to the Standing Committee on Railways and Telegraphs.

The Bill was read a second time and referred to the Committee accordingly.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

The Act in relation to the Library of Parliament, was read a second time and passed through Committee, Mr. SCATCHERD in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the salaries, and said either those of the officers connected with the Library were too high or those of other officers were too low.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the matter was a peculiar one and the measure would tend to economy. There was no increase in the salaries. The matter had to be arranged between the two Houses, and should be accepted, and if there were officers in other branches who were underpaid, their cases could be considered.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was a very invidious thing to consider any particular officers separately.

Mr. McDONALD (Glengarry), said the officers connected with the Library should

Hon. Mr. Langevin.

not be placed in a different position from the other officers of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON was also opposed to any exceptional consideration to the officers connected with the Library, and he thought the Government should leave the matter for another year, and then adopt a general measure.

Mr. MILLS said the Bill enacted no increase in the salaries of the Library officers, it was only the mode of payment that was changed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said of course if there was any difference in the treatment of the officers of the House, the Government would be ready to consider the matter. The member for Bothwell had explained that there was no increase in the salaries of the Library officers, and therefore, there was nothing unfair to other officers.

Mr. SCATCHERD thought the Bill as a whole tended to economy, but regretted that a larger amount was to be paid by the House of Commons than formerly. Ever since Confederation every extravagance had been exercised, and not a single instance of economy in the Public Service could be pointed out.

Mr. YOUNG said that no one class of officers should be treated differently from another.

The third reading of the Bill was declared carried on a division.

ESTIMATES.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS desired to make some general observations before going into Committee and to add some further remarks to the financial statement he had previously made. One of the leading journals of the day had thought proper to make some criticisms on the supplementary estimates, without waiting for any explanation, and he desired to show what an injustice had, in his opinion, been done to the Government. In his previous statement he had named the estimates at \$16,394,804, and revenue at \$16,810,000, leaving a surplus of \$415,196. To this might be added a reduction in the estimates really rated, of \$110,000. It had, however, been represented most unfairly, that the Government were coming down with supplementary estimates which must be placed against the estimated revenue, whereas a very considerable portion of those estimates were chargeable against capital. Every Government considered that there were many Public Works which could not be charged against revenue. For instance, no one could imagine it possible that the "Intercolonial" or the "Pacific" could be constructed out of revenue, or that the

Canal improvements could be effected out of revenue. If the Legislature of the country were not prepared to incur debt with a view to making great public improvements, the result of which would be vastly to increase the income, they must abandon the idea of making the improvements at all, because, of course, it was simply impossible that such improvements could be made out of income. Referring to the items themselves, one was for the very important work of raising the banks of the Welland Canal, with a view to obtaining a much greater depth of water, another was towards the enlargement of the Grenville Canal Locks, and another towards improving the channel of the river St. Lawrence, between Kingston and Montreal. He would not now enter into the merits of these particular items, but it was a gross misrepresentation to say that the Government ever contemplated making these improvements out of the revenue of the year. It had been stated that the result of these supplementary estimates would be that there would be a surplus of expenditure over income of something like one million of dollars, but he would show how very different would be the actual result. He would take the supplementary estimates and the income for the current and the ensuing year. The supplementary estimates for 1871 amounted to \$1,099,263.71 less \$250,000, for the survey of the Pacific Railway, not out of income, reducing the amount chargeable to income to \$849,263.71. For the year 1872 the amount was \$1,134,350, of which \$500,000 was chargeable to capital, leaving \$634,350, as the amount chargeable against income, making a total amount so chargeable of \$1,485,613.71. He had said in his statement of March last that there was an estimated surplus of \$1,892,627 for the current year, and he could now state that, after two months more experience, that surplus would be increased by half a million of dollars, making an aggregate surplus for the current year of \$2,392,627, so that with the surplus of \$523,900, for the year 1872, the total surplus would be \$2,916,527, —and the aggregate of the supplementary estimates being \$1,483,613.71, the total surplus amounted to \$1,432,93.29. This was not all. There would be an amount of some \$87,000 to be received on an offer which had been received for the purchase of the site of the present post office at Montreal, and in addition the Government expected to receive \$125,000 from the Imperial Government on account of the expenses of the North West, the entire cost having been charged in the estimates. These two amounts, say \$200,000, made a surplus of over \$1,600,000 for the two

years. He admitted that the estimates were unusually high, but he would say most distinctly that there was not one item that could not be justified as a necessary and desirable question in the interests of the country. The newspaper to which he had referred had taken exception to the item for the Montreal Post Office, but it was well known that the Post Office had been for years back most discreditable, and the reason the vote was not asked at first was that negotiations were still going on, and the Government did not expect to obtain a proper site this year, but now, although the matter was not definitely concluded, he believed they would succeed in getting the very best site in the city. Then there was the amount for the post offices at Toronto, Quebec and London. This was only a revote and had merely been omitted from the first estimates in error. Then there was an amount of \$50,000 for the Census in the North West and British Columbia, which had not been included in the original estimates. Another item had been criticised, that for clearing away the snow from the Public Buildings. This was merely caused by a change of mode of payment, the matter being now under the control of the Public Works Department, and the service was now being performed much more economically than formerly. He would not speak of the votes for light houses or harbors, for these could all be explained at the proper time, nor would he say much about the British Columbia vote, which slightly exceeded the amount which it had been supposed would be required. Of course the Government could not make a very accurate estimate, but they now asked what they thought would be required. There were two items however which had been particularly mentioned in the newspaper criticism he had referred to, namely: cost and damages awarded by juries in two customs cases. He detailed the circumstances under which the cases had arisen, and said that they being exactly similar, it was agreed that one should be brought before the Courts, and the decision given should govern both. This had been done and the decision given against the Government, and the Government had now to ask authority to pay the amounts, and so far from the claimants being satisfied, he knew they were deeply dissatisfied because they could not obtain interest on the amounts they had claimed. Then as to the Penitentiary near Montreal this was believed to be a very necessary undertaking. He could state without hesitation that no Government had ever been more scrupulous than the present in charging against income everything that could be legitimately so charged. As to the amount

for the Halifax Buildings he hoped the matter would be arranged and the money not expended, but he considered that as interest would have been received for the money, it would have been a fair charge against capital. He might say that the income of the year was well kept up, as in the first ten days of the present month about \$11,000 had been received more than was received last year, notwithstanding the repeal of the coal duty and the 5 per cent duties, and whatever opinion therefore might be formed with regard to particular items he could state with perfect confidence that there was no danger of any financial embarrassment, and that there was ample revenue to meet all the estimates. Before taking his seat he desired to refer to a statement which had been made on a former occasion that an official of the Government had interfered in election matters. If he remembered aright, it had been alleged that that official had gone to the County of Essex and had stated that Sir George Cartier desired the return of one candidate and the rejection of the other. He had enquired into the matter, and he was able to state first of all that it was absolutely incorrect to say that that officer was authorised by Sir George Cartier to say anything at all, secondly that he never used Sir G. Cartier's name, and third that the cause of his being there was his being on public duty connected with the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue. It had also been stated that the gentleman in question stated to the captain of a gunboat that he would be dismissed if he did not take a certain course, and he was authorised to say that he had no such communication with that captain and he (Sir Francis) had himself seen a telegram stating that the person alluded to had distinctly denied that any such statement had ever been made to him. After such a charge was made he thought it was only just to the gentleman concerned that he should make this explanation.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT said it must be satisfactory to all to find that the revenue was larger than anticipated, but it was decidedly unsatisfactory to find that the expenditures had also been very large. He thought the hon. member should have referred to these large supplementary estimates when he brought down his budget. In that speech the hon. gentleman had stated that the supplementary estimates would amount to about \$300,000. The estimates now brought down showed a sum of \$1,134,000, which was certainly a large increase. It was true that \$500,000 of that amount was chargeable to capital account, but even then there were \$634,000 to be added to ordinary account.

Hon. Sir F. Hincks.

There would, therefore, be an actual deficit during the ensuing year. The hon. gentlemen had not explained how he intended to make up the deficiency which would, undoubtedly, be caused by the removal of duties.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said he had taken this matter into calculation and the hon. member would see that whereas the income from Customs last year amounted to \$10,500,000, the estimates for the ensuing year were only \$10,000,000. He believed the income from Customs would largely exceed that amount.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT was glad to hear it. He would remark, however, that the supplementary estimates were largely in excess of what the Hon. Financial Minister had led the House to believe a month ago.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said he had already explained the cause of this increase.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT regretted to see the re-introduction of making appropriations for small local works. One of the advantages which had been looked for as a result of Confederation, was the total abolition of this objectionable system, and he regretted to see it adopted by the Government again, many of the items now brought down should have appeared in the general estimates.

THE MURDER OF SCOTT.

On the motion to go into Committee of Supply,

Mr. RYMAL moved that all the words after "that" be left out and the following inserted:—This House regrets that the Government of the day have done nothing towards procuring the punishment of the murderers of Thos. Scott, and that an humble address be presented to His Excellency, praying that he may take such steps and make such exertions as may be best calculated to bring these men to justice." He said he had hoped that the Government would have taken up this matter before now. But, as they had failed to do so, and as the murderers were walking about the streets of Fort Garry in broad daylight unmolested, he felt it his duty to place this motion in the hands of the Speaker. He (Mr. Rymal) was the last to appeal to party or sectional prejudices, but in the part of Ontario which he represented, there was a feeling of determination to bring the murderers of poor Scott to justice, and this feeling was increased by the knowledge that the late rebels were now the men who were appointed to office, while loyal men were slighted and neglected. Of all the bad things of which the Government had been

guilty, this abuse of the public patronage was the worst, after the shameless avowal made by a Minister of the Cabinet the other day, of having prostituted the public patronage, he believed that His Excellency should refuse to be advised by such a man, and say to them "get thee behind me Satan." It was high time that the murderers in Manitoba should be punished, and that an amnesty should be granted to all others who were guilty of merely political offences. He regretted that the time had passed when a British subject could say that his life was sacred, and could not be sacrificed without bringing speedy punishment on his murderers.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said every member in the House must deplore in his inmost heart, the murder of that unfortunate man Scott. He (Sir Geo.) denied that any sympathy existed in Quebec for the murderers. There was no doubt that there had been an irritated feeling among the people of Quebec at the time, but it arose from no sympathy with the murderers, but from unfounded charges of newspapers in Ontario, that the priesthood in Manitoba were implicated in the crime. He deplored that this matter should be brought before the House again and in such a manner. The hon. member had introduced the motion in a sort of jocular manner, wholly unsuited to the occasion. He (Sir Geo.) hoped the House would join with him in condemning, not only the motion, but the manner in which it had been introduced, (hear, hear). The Government never had the power to bring the murderers to justice. At the time that the crime was committed this Government had no jurisdiction in the North-West. When Manitoba was erected into a Province the administration of justice rested with the Local Government and not with this Government. How then was this Government responsible, when this Parliament had, by its own Act, handed the jurisdiction over criminal matters to the Local authorities. But, even though the Ashburton treaty had extended to the North-West, this crime did not come under it, for high treason and murder committed in furtherance of high treason were not extraditable crimes under that treaty. He could not understand how any hon. member, after the repeated explanations which had been made by members of the Government respecting this matter, could have brought it up again. He knew of but one reason for it, and that was to create party feeling at the close of the session. Then with regard to the charge that the Government had abused their power in bestowing patronage in Manitoba. The hon. member knew very well that the only patronage they had at

their disposal was the appointment of the Lt. Governor of the North-West, and could a better appointment have been made than that of Mr. Archibald? Judge Johnston had also been appointed by this Government, and no one had ever disputed the wisdom of making that appointment. These were the only two appointments made in that Province by the Dominion Government. Then the hon. member had asked, "why not proclaim an amnesty?" The reason was that it could only be done under the authority of the Queen. An amnesty could not be proclaimed by this Government. He (Sir Geo.) hoped this would be the last of these motions. The hon. member knew well when he proposed it that it would not be carried, and it would be as well to withdraw it.

Mr. RYMAL said he had no intention to withdraw his motion. It was no sham, and he did not believe in shams. Would the Minister of Militia tell him, if this Government had no authority in Manitoba, why they were able to issue a reward for the apprehension of the murderers of Hon. Mr. McGee, and when the murderer was arrested, how it was that they could employ legal counsel to conduct the case? Had not the Government the same authority in Manitoba? he believed they had, and that they should exercise it in bringing the murderers to justice.

Hon. Sir Geo. E. CARTIER said that the murderers of Thos. Scott were in a foreign country, and it was useless to offer a reward for their punishment.

Mr. BOWELL said he did not understand why this motion should create irritation on the Government side of the House, any more than among the Opposition. Although he would support the motion of the hon. member for Wentworth, he would have preferred that the hon. member should have waited till the House went into Committee of Supply, and then, on reaching the item to compensate those who had sustained losses by the rebellion in Rupert's Land, he could have brought forward his motion. He (Mr. Bowell) could not agree with the Minister of Militia, in holding up Governor Archibald as a great and good man. The appointments that the hon. gentleman had made in the new Province proclaimed him to be anything but that. Then, with respect to the statement that the murderers of Thos. Scott were in a foreign country, he would refer the Hon. Minister of Militia to the papers if he wished to learn the whereabouts of these men. It was publicly reported (and no one denied the statement) that they were in Manitoba at present and no one interfered to arrest them. If so,

it was a disgrace to this Dominion. He believed that the root of the whole North West difficulty lay in the Hudson's Bay Territory, and he did not entirely blame the people who had risen in rebellion. Still he thought that the Lieutenant Governor might have appointed some of the loyal men to office, instead of filling all the offices with the late rebels. Bannatyne, who was formerly Postmaster at Fort Garry and whose connection with Riel was notorious, was now Postmaster there. Yet this was an office in the gift of this Government. Another of the recent appointments made in Manitoba was that of Spence, formerly editor of the *New Nation*, the mouth-piece of the rebel Government. The hon. member for Selkirk had endeavored to represent this man as a mere employé who edited the paper for others on a salary; but the facts were different. This man who had turned a traitor to his country and used all his power and influence to stir up strife in the North West was now appointed to an important office. These and other appointments made by that "great and good" Governor Archibald were sufficient to show that the rebels were the only men who had been treated with any degree of consideration in the new Province. If the hon. members opposite really felt horrified at the murder of poor Scott, in justice to themselves they should have asked Her Majesty either to grant an amnesty clearing them all or to have taken the same steps to secure the arrest of the murderers in the same manner as had been done when Hon. Mr. McGee was murdered.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER did not intend to follow the discussion raised by the hon. member for North Wentworth, at any length. He was not surprised at the course taken by that hon. member; but he was surprised that the hon. member for West Hastings should lend himself to support this motion. He was satisfied that the hon. gentleman could not have examined the subject in his usual logical manner when he supported a motion, the object of which, was to stop the supplies and embarrass the whole Government of the country. If the hon. member for Wentworth was really sincere in bringing up this motion, he would have taken a better opportunity to have it before the House. After the statements made on both sides of the House, by the Hon. Minister of Militia on the one side, and the hon. member for West Durham on the other.

Mr. BLAKE—I never supported the Hon. Minister of Militia's views on this subject.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—Then if the hon.

Mr. Bowell.

member for West Durham thought that this Government had jurisdiction in this matter, with his legal knowledge, he should not have left it to the hon. member for North Wentworth to bring it up at this late hour of the session. The hon. member knew that this Government had no more authority in the North West, when this murder was committed, than they had in the Kingdom of Greece.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Are you sure of that?

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that the very highest legal authorities sustained that view of it, and it was beyond doubt the correct view. The hon. members opposite had spoken of the jurisdiction of this Government in the North West in a manner which was totally opposed to the principle of Responsible Government. This House had decided that there was good ground for the complaints of the people of Manitoba, and their refusal to accept the conditions offered them by this Parliament. When the murder of Thos. Scott occurred and their country was convulsed with horror, this Government could do nothing, except as they could advise the Government of Ontario. With respect to Lieut. Governor Archibald, he would say that in the Legislature of Nova Scotia he had been opposed to that hon. gentleman for years, and there was not a man in the Province who enjoyed a higher reputation. Governor Archibald was a man of unstained political reputation, a man occupying the highest and most respectable position, not only as a public man, but in his private character. He was sent to the North West to administer the Government, not according to despotic rule or according to the views of the Government he had left behind him here, but according to the best of his judgment. When he went there he found the population rent in twain, and the result of his rule was that he was unanimously sustained by the people of the Province. Instead of violence and bloodshed peace and good order now reigned. As to the reference that had been made to the Volunteers, instead of there being on the part of the people of Manitoba, a hue and cry to get rid of those volunteers, the statements of the representatives of that country and the record of several public meetings that had been held, shewed that the people were most anxious that the volunteers should remain. He thought that if the results were a fair test, Mr. Archibald's course, although mistakes might have occurred, ought to give unqualified satisfaction to the people of the Dominion. He would not have risen to his feet had he not felt that knowing Mr. Archibald, and knowing that he was entitled to the confidence

of the House and of the country, and to the grateful thanks of the people, he would have done injustice to his feelings had he remained silent. Every one could see, however, that the motion was brought at a time, and with the avowed object of obstructing the Government and deranging the public business, and it was founded on statements that were not true. It was stated that Government had power to deal with the question. He need not remind the House of the terms of the Extradition Treaty which had already been so clearly explained. The crime Mr. Riel and other parties were charged with was the crime of murder, and murder connected with high treason, and the demand for extradition, if made at all, would have to have been made by Great Britain, because the crime occurred in a British Possession. Well, why did not Great Britain deal with the matter? Why, knowing her rights under the Extradition Treaty, she knew she would render herself an object of ridicule if she demanded the extradition of a criminal on the charge of high treason. No country could ask extradition on such a charge. Again, it had been asked why an amnesty was not given. Every one knew that the Government had no power to grant an amnesty, and that the Queen herself had no power to do so, it could alone be done by an Act of the Imperial Government. He thought he had shewn that in this matter the Government had been assailed for not doing what neither Law nor Constitution enabled them to do, and also that Mr. Archibald had discharged his duty to the best of his ability, and with a single eye to the peace and the prosperity of the Province under his care, and in undertaking a task so difficult he was entitled to the favorable consideration of the House and the country.

Hon. Mr. WOOD joined issue with the Hon. Minister of Militia and others who declared that this Government had no jurisdiction over the North West at any time. An Imperial Statute passed in 1803 issued a commission appointing persons to take information, issue warrants, apprehend parties, and bring them to the Province of Lower Canada, or as issued directly under seal of Lower Canada to Upper Canada, and try them before the proper tribunals. Under this Act, two persons at least [Brown and Boucher] were arrested in the North West and tried at Little York. In 1818 the Hudson's Bay Co. entered into bonds with the Imperial Government, in the sum of £5000 stg. to apprehend in their own territory themselves and hand over criminals for trial by the Government of Lower Canada under this Imperial Act. In the transfer of the North West to Canada, this power was transferred to the Governor

General of the Dominion from the Governor General of Canada. [Hear, hear.] Now, in the face of these facts all the fine arguments of the hon. members opposite were the most worthless balderdash. [Order, order!] It was absurd to say that while these acts remained in force (and they had never been repealed) that this Government had not authority to punish any crime committed in the North West. The President of the Council had stated that murder was not within the limit of the Extradition Act. Well, every one knew that political offences were not within the scope of the Act, but murder certainly was, and no Government would ever hesitate to deliver up a murderer. There was, however, a period of time when the Dominion Government had authority and jurisdiction over the North West. By Order in Council it was transferred to the Dominion of Canada, and along with it the obligation to preserve the peace and to punish crime, and at that time most unquestionably the Dominion Government had jurisdiction, and he would ask the President of the Council, who had jurisdiction, if the Dominion of Canada had not, from the date of the transfer to the time of the erection of the Province. It was perfectly plain that no one had ever had any jurisdiction but the Governor General and Government of Canada, and no one but that Government was responsible for the non-execution of the law. It might not have been politic to punish the crime, but certainly the power existed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he was surprised to hear such an argument from a legal gentleman. The hon. member had tried to shew that the Dominion Government had the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction in the Red River, and had quoted an Imperial Act of 1803 which enabled the Hudson's Bay Company to bring down criminals to Lower Canada, and to have them tried there. He remembered a case of a poor Indian having been brought down on a charge of murder and tried in the District of Three Rivers because it was alleged that if the boundary lines of that district were extended they would enclose the place at which the murder was committed. The man was found guilty and condemned to death, but a philanthropic Society in England took up his case and proved clearly that there was a mistake territorially, and succeeded in obtaining a pardon. The Act of 1803 cited was afterwards amended in 1815 or 1816, giving to Upper Canada the right to the same jurisdiction, to some extent. The Confederation Act, however, deprived the Dominion Government of the administration of justice in any Province, and the hon. member had quoted the 12th clause,

but if he would read that clause and the 65th clause also, he would find that his whole argument was false and without foundation, and that the administration of Justice rested entirely with the Local Government. The hon. gentleman had further stated that by the Act of 1818 by which the Hudson's Bay Company were required to hand over criminals for trial to the Governor of Lower Canada, was transferred to the Governor General of the Dominion in 1867. Under the Manitoba Act it was provided that from and after the date of the transference of the North West to Canada all legislation with regard to the province should take place. That only took place on the 15th July, and it was afterwards necessary to send an expedition to Red River to restore order. All persons who were guilty of the murder had then escaped to a foreign country and he challenged the hon. member for Brant to show at what time the Dominion Government had jurisdiction in the North West.

Mr. DONALD SMITH said he had been present at Fort Garry when Thomas Scott was murdered and had done all in his power to save the life of that poor man. It had been asserted in the public press of Ontario that the Hudson's Bay Company with others had conspired to prevent justice being done to the murderers. A number of excited people—some forty or fifty of them—came to him (Smith) asking to be sworn in as special constables to arrest the murderers. They said, "We will go to shoot them down, but not to take them in any other way." They demanded a warrant to commit murder, in fact. He refused to give them a warrant. They afterwards obtained one, but by that time the murderers had escaped. This was before the arrival of Governor Archibald. In reply to the hon. member for Hastings, he (Smith) would say that Mr. Donnell, one of the appointments referred to, was never friendly with Riel, and had in fact been imprisoned by the rebel chief. He (Smith) denied that Mr. Bannatyne had ever opened letters, as had been charged against him. He had opened one, but it was under compulsion. With regard to Spence and the *New Nation*, he (Smith) believed if the hon. member would look at the file subsequent to April 1st, when Spence took charge of it, he would see that the tone of it was greatly improved. Although some persons had censured Governor Archibald, the great body of the people sustained him. These were a few facts in reply to the honorable member for Hastings.

Dr. SCHULTZ said he regretted to find that a member from Manitoba should have

thought it necessary to join in this discussion to stir up a dirty puddle. The hon. member had done so to make a personal statement, and he (Dr. Schultz) would also make a statement respecting the application made to the hon. member for Selkirk for a warrant to arrest the murderers of Thos. Scott. He (Dr. Schultz) was not in the Province when the event occurred, but he held evidence in his hand in the shape of an affidavit from Thos. Lusted reciting the facts connected with the case and affirming that he believed Donald Smith was anxious to give Riel and Lepine time to escape. He (Dr. Schultz) wished to place this matter on record and let it drop, but if the hon. member for Selkirk desired to refer to it as he had done, he (Dr. Schultz) felt it his duty to place the facts of his party before the public, too.

Mr. D. A. SMITH repeated his explanation respecting his refusal to issue a warrant when applied to for one—could he have given a warrant under such circumstances? This very Thos. Lusted said to him (Mr. Smith) on the very evening of the same day that a warrant should not have been issued under such circumstances. When these men applied for a warrant, the Lord Bishop of Rupert's Land and a number of the most respectable men in the place were present.

Mr. BLAKE said there was a time, and not so long ago, when the Governor-General was induced to proclaim that he had control over the North West. In his proclamation, Sir John Young made use of these words: "I shall order that no legal proceedings be taken against any party implicated in these unfortunate breaches of law." This was done in his capacity as Governor-General, and by the advice of his Council. He (Mr. Blake) asserted that this Government had power to deal with this matter. Their very Act of this afternoon in extending criminal law to Manitoba, was proof of it, this Government had authority to procure the arrest of the murderers of Thos. Scott, who were walking about Manitoba in broad daylight. If Riel was in the United States Lepine was not. It was well known that he was in Manitoba, and if no tribunal existed there to arrest and bring him to trial, it was the duty of this Government to bring down a proposal to establish a regular court there for the execution of the criminal laws. It might be possible that Riel's crime was not an extraditable offence, but he (Mr. Blake) denied that such trouble as that which took place in the North West should be looked upon as a political movement. Mr. Donald A. Smith was, at the time of the murder, in the Red River country,

Hon. Sir G. E. Cartier.

treating with the people for a Union of the North West with Canada. What were the excuses alleged for the murder of Scott? Not that his offence was a political one. The murder was perpetrated on grounds of purely personal revenge. Under the circumstances his extradition should be asked from the United States Government, and we had a better right to demand it than that Government had to obtain the extradition of Burleigh. At any rate it was the duty of the Government to use all their power to obtain the extradition of the murderer. But, throwing all these arguments aside, what were the reasons for this delay in bringing the murderers to justice. The President of the Council had acknowledged that there was good ground for dissatisfaction against Canada.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said his statement was that any one who had listened to the representations of the people could hardly help feeling that they had ground for dissatisfaction.

Mr. BLAKE—Well it amounted to the same thing. The circumstances at any rate remained and could not be explained away. They sent a Commissioner to ascertain the cause of complaints and did every thing to show our consideration, and at the same time we found a Canadian brutally murdered, and were they to be told that premeditated insult being inflicted on this country, no step could be taken to punish the crime? The case of the late Mr. McGee had been alluded to. Was nothing done then? Government then knew that a reward would be a great stimulus, and they acted promptly, without any scruples as to their jurisdiction, and after offering the large reward, themselves conducted the prosecution of the murderer, although they had no cause to believe that the Ontario Government would fail to do its duty. If they could do this why could they not do something in the case of Scott? They could have applied to the Lieut. Governor to use his utmost endeavours to procure the arrest of the murderers, and he could have acted or not. Therefore putting aside Extradition or the establishment of a Court, the Government was guilty of neglect in having failed to do what they might have done, and ought to be called upon now to take every possible step in the prosecution of the matter. He was convinced that the Government ought at first to have done all in its power to arrest the men, but it had done nothing at all, and stated that it intended to do nothing. They were sent from one place to another, the Minister of Justice sent them to England, from Ontario they were sent here, and from here they were sent to Manitoba. Where should they go, baffled in their at-

tempts to obtain justice? Where should they go if not to the Imperial Parliament to express their regret that this had not been done.

Mr. FERGUSON was happy to be able to agree for once with the hon. member for West Durham. The hon. gentleman had found by experience that the Ontario Government had not the power to deal with the case and that the only place where such a motion should be brought forward was in the Dominion Parliament. It seemed to be admitted that some of the men were still in the North West, and if they were not arrested, he thought the military would not do their duty. His belief was that those men could have been arrested and brought to justice without any warrant, and certainly if it were true that these villains were in the country and Governor Archibald and his Government did not arrest them and bring them to justice, they would not do their duty. Whether extradition could be obtained or not the application ought to be made. After reading Mr. Smith's report his opinion of Riel was a thousand times worse than it had been before. He thought the proposition however rather ill-timed, and that it should have been a substantive motion, as it was not stopping the supplies, and was passing a vote of censure on the Government. But whether the supplies were stopped or not, justice ought to be done on Scott's murderers, who ought to be condemned by every honest thinking man in the country, and if the authorities did not arrest them they were worthy of all censure.

Mr. McDONALD (Antigonish) said he regretted that any murder should be used in order to make political capital, and he was surprised at the serio-comic way in which the motion had been introduced. Touching the power of the Government in this matter, he could not agree with the member for Brant, and thought the jurisdiction had never been transferred to the Governor General. The North West was no part of Canada at the time of the murder and the jurisdiction in criminal matters then rested either with the Hudson's Bay Territory or the Imperial Government. Was the House to be told that there was no Court in the North West to try murder.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—No.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER—Yes.

Mr. McDONALD concluded by referring to the murder of McGee, which he said was entirely different from the Scott murder, and was entirely within the Dominion, the other was committed outside of Canada.

Mr. JACKSON said that before the vote was taken he desired to state the grounds on which he should justify his own. That a murder had been committed—a foul and unprovoked murder—there was no doubt, and that the only reason assigned for such a barbarity was the loyalty of poor Scott. He believed that justice would overtake the culprits. The wrongdoer cannot escape from the consequences of his own act, but it was now charged against the Government that it had refused to render that aid in the administration of justice which was its peculiar function. Now this is either true or not true. The motion made by the member for Wentworth affirms that they are chargeable with guilty negligence and yet nobody has pointed out the way in which they should have acted. Most of the gentlemen who have spoken have taken different views of the subject, and he inferred from the speech just made by the hon. member for West Durham that he did not believe that either Ontario or Quebec had criminal jurisdiction in the matter. He has cited the action of the Dominion Government at the time of the murder of the late Mr. McGee to show that the Government should press this matter upon the attention of the Government of Manitoba. This then is an admission that in the opinion of the member for West Durham the tribunals of Manitoba are invested with the authority. Grant this, and now that the Government of Manitoba is being organized the Government of the Dominion should not be held responsible for having failed to negotiate with a Government that has scarcely yet entered upon its existence. He considered that the occasion and time chosen for the introduction of this motion afforded some clue to the character of the motives which influenced its promoters. All men act by motives, and motives give moral quality to actions. Now, while repudiating the intention of imputing motives he might ask whether it would be the slightest infringement upon the rules of charity to say that the only underlying motive which prompted the mover was to render some service in the interests of faction. What becomes of the boast of the opposition that they did not desire to mix up the death of Scott with the tactics of party? At the end of the session when the motion to go into Committee of Supply was before the House, and when the question—owing to these circumstances—becomes a question of confidence or non-confidence in the Government, it cannot be discussed on its merits. He therefore said that he believed the mover of the amendment, who in submitting it, had indulged in the mock heroic, was much less solicitous of avenging the murder of Scott than

Mr. McDonald.

of pandering to the unreasoning prejudices of a party. With these views, and in view of all the responsibilities which could attach to his action, and with a desire to stand acquitted by his own conscience he (Mr. Jackson) would vote against the motion in amendment.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said this matter had been brought up in the Local Legislature of Ontario for political purposes, and it had its temporary effect as every one knew. But the gentleman who had brought it on there had not taken it up here, but left it to the hon. member for Wentworth. The hon. member for Brant also had endeavored to throw the whole responsibility on the Government, but he (Mr. Dunkin) thought that the reply of the Minister of Militia had quite silenced that hon. member. There remained only the argument of the hon. member for West Durham to be refuted. That hon. gentleman had made a great flourish about the proclamation issued by Sir John Young, but he forgot that it was issued in the name of the Queen, and by direct command of Her Majesty. This Government had no control in Manitoba, and though they could request the Local Legislature to hold a court, they could not compel them to do so. With regard to the argument respecting extradition, he would simply say that the treaty did not extend to the North West, but, even though it did, it was the place of the Local Legislature to make the demand, and not this Government. It was a most undignified position for this House to assume, to endeavor to coerce a small Province into doing what they would not dare to demand a large Province to undertake. The motion was ill-timed and absurd, and he hoped it would be voted down.

Mr. RYMAL said he had been most serious in his motion and could appeal to all who had known him whether he was ever guilty of any unnecessary lightness. It was the matter not the manner of his motion that had taken effect.

The amendment was put and the vote resulted as follows:—Yeas 40, Nays 75.

YEAS.—Messrs. Ault, Blake, Bowell, Brown, Burpee, Burton, Dobbie, Drew, Ferguson, Ferris, Jones (Leeds and Grenville), Killam, Little, Macdonald (Glen-garry), MacFarlane, Mackenzie, Magill, McConkey, McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Mills, Morrison (Victoria, O.), Munroe, Oliver, Pickard, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C. R.), Rymal, Scatcherd, Schultz, Snider, Stirton, Wallace, Wells, White (Halton), White (East Hastings), Wood, Wright (York, Ontario, W. R.), and Young.—40.

NAYS.—Messrs. Anglin, Archambeault,

Baker, Barthe, Bellerose, Benoit, Blanchet, Bourassa, Bown, Brousseau, Cameron (Inverness), Caron, Cartier (Sir George E.), Cheval, Cimon, Costigan, DeLorme (Provencher), DeLorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortier, Fortin, Fournier, Gaucher, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Gendron, Gibbs, Godin, Grant, Gray, Hincks (Sir Francis), Holton, Howe, Hurdon, Jackson, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, McDonald (Antigonish), McDonald (Lunenburg), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, McMillan, Moffat, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Paquet, Pinsonneault, Pope, Pozer, Renaud, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ryan (King's, N. B.), Simard, Simpson, Smith (Selkirk), Sproat, Stephenson, Tilley, Tourangeau, Tremblay, Tupper, Walsh, Webb, and Wright (Ottawa Co.)—75.

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Hon. Mr. BLANCHET in the chair.

The supplementary estimates were passed through Committee *pro forma*, on the understanding that full discussion would be allowed on concurrence.

The House adjourned at 2:45 this a. m., till 2 p. m. to-day.

THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 12, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed.

Act to enable the Northern Railway to use other lines.

Act to incorporate the Dominion Telegraph Co.

In Committee of the whole the Election Bill was considered. The verbal amendments proposed by Hon. Mr. Dickey with reference to the clause relating to Nova Scotia were adopted.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST proposed an amendment to the clause relating to the closing of houses of entertainment on polling days, that the words "or other houses" be added.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL opposed the amendment, as it would prevent voters from a distance obtaining necessary subsistence. The amendment was lost.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST

objected to Bills being passed without being distributed to the members.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said it arose from the economical arrangement of the joint committee on Printing.

Hon. Mr. AIKINS assured the House that the printer had performed the work submitted to him for both Houses, and for departments in a most satisfactory manner, and so long as he did not complain of the price of the contract, the House had no reason to complain. The contractor had done more printing in the past two months than had been done in any previous twelve months.

Hon. Mr. SKEAD argued that the contractor had obtained large plant and several presses to do the work, and thought he should be better paid. This was his only objection to the present system.

The Bill was then read a third time.

Several Bills from the Commons were advanced a stage.

The Act incorporating the Mutual Insurance Company of Canada, (Hon. Mr. Sanborn moving several amendments which were lost), the Act to incorporate the St. Mary's Bridge Company were read a third time.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL in reply, stated that no day was yet fixed for prorogation.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL reported to the House that he and those members of this House who are members of the Privy Council, had waited on His Excellency the Governor General with the Addresses to Her Majesty the Queen, and to His Excellency on the subject of the admission of British Columbia into union with the Dominion of Canada, and that His Excellency was pleased to return the following most gracious answer:—

LISGAR,

The Governor General has received the Address to the Queen which the Senate has passed "on the subject of the admission of British Columbia into the union with the Dominion of Canada," and informs the Senate that in accordance with their desire no time shall be lost in transmitting the Address to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the colonies, in order that it may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Government House,

Ottawa, April 11th, 1871.

Some other business was transacted and the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY 12th April, 1871.

After routine,

A message was received from His Excellency announcing that the Address for the Union of British Columbia with Canada should be presented to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies without delay.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. BLAKE called attention to an important question of privilege. In the passage of the Manitoba Act no provision had been made for the trial of controverted elections. There were two such cases now in Manitoba, and having regard to the distance from the North West, and the late period of the session, some provision should be made to have these election cases tried. He believed it was the duty of the Government to take steps without delay to have this difficulty remedied. He therefore moved that the petitions be presented to and received by this House against the election and return of Donald A. Smith, sitting member for Selkirk, and Pierre Delorme, sitting member for Provencher; that no provision has been made for the trial of controverted elections in the Province of Manitoba; that the expense and delay involved in the trials of said elections to be regulated and commenced between the beginning and the end of the ensuing session of Parliament, render such trials abortive, and that to avoid this result and secure a legal trial of these questions during the recess of Parliament.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said this was a matter to be settled by this House in the manner in which they should direct from time to time. They were of course masters of their own rights and privileges in the absence of any law, and being masters of the situation could either take the petitions into consideration in a committee of the whole House, or refer them in the meantime to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to obtain evidence. Before the law was passed regulating the manner in which controverted elections should be tried, the petitions were considered by a committee of the whole House. In the present instance that would be the proper course to take. But the complainant should be ready with his evidence, and unless the hon. member for West Durham was so prepared, he should not have moved this resolution. The hon. member virtually proposed a commission in this instance which was a proposal foreign to constitutional

and parliamentary practice. It would be unsafe and improper to do so during recess. This motion was beyond the powers of Parliament and should be rejected.

Mr. BLAKE argued that this motion would be a regular Constitutional Law, if carried, and not a provision to meet an exceptional case. The resolution once carried, a Bill could be founded on it and made law by this time to-morrow. To leave the law in its present state would be disgraceful and scandalous to this House, and to leave the trial of these elections over till next session and to bring witnesses all the way from Manitoba to Ottawa was unjust to all parties concerned.

Hon. Sir A. T. GALT approved of the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, and believed that, late though it was in the session, a general law should be passed for the trial of controverted elections, not only in Manitoba but also in British Columbia.

Hon. Sir GEORGE E. CARTIER said this idea of enacting a general law was a second thought with the hon. member for West Durham, who would never have thought of it, if he (Sir George) had not mentioned it. He was glad that he had drawn an explanation of the motion from the hon. member who had introduced it. He (Sir George) would move in amendment "that the petitions against the elections of D. A. Smith and Pierre Delorme be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to meet forthwith and report to the House the procedure to be adopted with regard to the said petitions, in order that the rights of all parties concerned therein may be duly protected."

Hon. Mr. HOLTON regretted that the Hon. Minister of Militia should have taken this course. Unless the hon. gentleman was prepared to continue the session a few days longer to take some action on the report of the committee it was practically a sham to send these petitions to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON argued that the petitions should be dealt with in exactly the same way as others, *i. e.* allowed to remain over till next session, since they had been presented in this House too late to be dealt with during the present session.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said the matter divested of legal technicalities stood in this way—practical injustice would be done to the petitioners if their cases were allowed to stand over till next session. It was the duty of the hon. gentlemen opposite to have taken steps to secure justice to these men instead of leaving it to a member of the Opposition to take it up. The motion to send it to the Committee on

Mr. Blake.

Privileges and Elections on the last day of the session looked very like an attempt to deny justice altogether. The House had the power to deal with this case without waiting till next session. The evidence could be taken in Manitoba during the recess and at the next session of parliament a decision could be given without delay.

Mr. BLAKE said no one had denied the necessity of legislation to deal with these cases. To send it to a standing committee, when it was very improbable that a quorum could be obtained, was to defeat that end. The report could not be laid before the House till to-morrow, when it was proposed to prorogue Parliament. If the Hon. Minister of Militia would accept a compromise, he (Mr. Blake) would move that leave be given to introduce a Bill to provide for the issuing of a commission to take evidence for the trial of these elections.

Hon. J. H. CAMERON suggested that the petitions be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. They could meet during the six o'clock recess and report a Bill to the House this evening.

The amendment of the Hon. Minister of Militia was declared carried on a division and the motion as amended was carried.

SUPPLY.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the reception of the report of the Committee of Supply.

The votes of \$624,000 for canals, and \$724,600 for public works and buildings, chargeable to income, were carried without discussion.

On the motion to receive the report of the Committee of Supply on the Supplementary Estimates,

Mr. YOUNG referred to the statement of the Hon. Finance Minister respecting the anticipated surplus. The hon. member had given no data to support his statement that there would be a surplus of over two and a quarter millions of dollars. The amount claimed by the hon. gentleman in his budget speech was \$2,392,000; but the amount chargeable to ordinary revenue in the supplementary estimates was \$850,000, which, deducted from the anticipated surplus, would reduce it to about a million and a half. When the other proposed expenditures were taken into account it would be found that there would be a deficit of about \$218,000 instead of a surplus. This he deduced from the figures furnished by the Finance Minister himself. The ordinary expenditure for the year was estimated at \$17,028,360.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS begged leave to explain that a large portion of this

was for extraordinary expenditure not chargeable to the income of the year, such as public buildings, &c. One of the causes of this large expenditure was because his predecessor had been obliged to postpone the construction of these public buildings through the want of the necessary funds.

Mr. YOUNG referred to the increase in four years from twelve to sixteen millions of dollars. The increase was steady and could well be called alarming when it was remembered that it was upwards of four million of dollars in four years. He thought some check should be put to the ruinous expenditure.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said that the finances, under the able management of the present Finance Minister, had been lifted from a very embarrassing condition to one very satisfactory indeed. If the debt of the country had been increased it was in constructing very useful and indispensable works. The Finance Minister had contrived to get rid of the "silver nuisance," and in replacing it by fractional currency had done the country very great service. He (Mr. Howe) condemned this general denunciation of the financial policy of the Government.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON remembered the time when the Hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces held a very different opinion of the abilities of the Hon. Finance Minister from that expressed by him this afternoon. He (Mr. Holton) admitted the ability of the Hon. Finance Minister, but he did not believe in flattering the hon. gentleman by imputing to his management the prosperity which was the result of the industry of the country.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said reference had been made to some fancied differences between himself and the Finance Minister, but though they had differed in time past on one point, they were old friends.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said with regard to the proposed Penitentiary at Montreal, it had been found that the Kingston Penitentiary was so crowded that another would have to be built, and as that was in Ontario, it was thought that this should be in Quebec, and the Government therefore decided to ask a vote of money for the purpose. They intended to take the Reformatory at St. Vincent de Paul, to transfer a number of convicts to that place, and set them to work at extending the building and making it suitable for a Penitentiary.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON agreed as to the necessity of a Penitentiary in Lower Canada, but it was singular that this large item should be in the Supplementary Estimates for this year. He objected, however, as

strongly as possible to the obtention of an old building, erected for different objects, and incapable of being made suitable for the purposes required. He hoped this feature of the project would be abandoned, and a vote taken for an entirely new building. A Reformatory could never be made suitable for a Penitentiary.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member did not seem to understand the real circumstances of the case. He admitted the necessity of a Penitentiary in the neighbourhood of Montreal—indeed this could not be doubted when it was remembered that there were some 800 prisoners at Kingston, who had only been kept in order by good management by the different wardens. It was necessary that at least 100 should be at once removed, and the Government in selecting St. Vincent de Paul had selected the very best site for the building—it was within easy communication of Montreal, it had quarries in the neighbourhood, and was a very healthy place, and all produce could easily be got to market. The site had been examined over and over again by engineers, and Mr. Horsey, the architect of the Kingston Penitentiary, had enquired into the matter thoroughly, and had reported that St. Vincent de Paul was the very best site that could be obtained. The building was a new instead of an old one, and at the time it was built the idea of converting it into a penitentiary was kept in view, and the plans adopted were such that the building should be of such a character as that it would be suitable for a penitentiary. Mr. Horsey had reported in favor of this site on the ground of economy also, as very little expenditure was necessary to make it at once available for a penitentiary, and another advantage would be that a number of convicts could be at once transferred and set to work on the proposed extension.

Hon. Mr. DORION did not consider the situation proposed a suitable one for a penitentiary, and as it had not been constructed for a penitentiary many changes would have to be made. It was in the centre of a village, and was not accessible by railway or navigation, and was, therefore, not a suitable situation, as there would be great difficulty in obtaining and sending away produce. The ground also was mere rock.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that the objection of the ground being stony was in fact an advantage, as stone could be obtained for the buildings. As to farms, there was no difficulty in obtaining them, for, even if people would not sell their farms, they could be expropriated, and the country was most favorable for farming operations.

Hon. Mr. Holton.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) opposed the choice of the site at St. Vincent de Paul, and spoke of Point Clair or Lachine as much more suitable. The building might be suitable for a Reformatory, but certainly not for a Penitentiary.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said with regard to salubrity, water, and building material the site might have its advantages, but the difficult nature of communication was an insuperable objection. He strongly objected to the matter not having been included in the regular estimates so that there might have been a deliberate discussion. He believed a great error was being committed, but it would be futile to appeal to such thin benches, and Government were precluding Parliament from expressing a proper opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE assumed that the vote was taken for the purchase only and asked whether communication had been had with the Local Government.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Local Government had offered the buildings at a reasonable price.

Hon. Mr. DORION thought the cost of the building would show the value, and he thought the amount asked very much in excess of what should be paid.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said the reason this item was in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year was that there being a considerable surplus it would be more convenient to have a vote in the present year, and there was no intention to prevent discussion.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said he had been a member of the Quebec Government when the overtore for sale was made, and their only reason was that the building was so essentially suitable for a penitentiary it was not what they wanted for a reformatory. There could be no difficulty in arriving at the price.

Mr. MACKENZIE said particulars ought to have been furnished as to the cost of purchase and the amount required for alterations.

Hon. Mr. DUNKIN said no particular amount had been asked by the Local Government.

Mr. SCATCHERD asked whether the building was to serve as a Reformatory for the Local Government and a Penitentiary for the Dominion.

[No, No], from the ministerial benches.

Mr. MACKENZIE thought special authority would have to be asked for the purchase.

Item carried.

The following items were then carried:—
Penitentiary near Montreal, \$120,000

Surveys and Inspections, \$10,000; East Pier, Port Dalhousie, \$13,400; Mabou Harbor, \$12,000; Lighthouse, Cape Jourimain, \$500; removal of snow, public buildings, Ottawa, \$3,000; rent Custom House buildings, St. John, N. B., \$3,150; dredge vessel, New Brunswick, 2,500.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) thought it was a mistake to take away the snow by contract, as he feared great injury would be done to the slate.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said there was no contract for the removal of the snow from the roof, which was done by their own men under special surveillance. Formerly the removal of the snow was paid for by sums out of the contingencies of the two Houses and the different Departments, and the work had not been done properly, and, therefore, it had been left to contract.

Mr. MACKENZIE objected to the amount of rent for Custom House buildings at St. John.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN explained that this was for the rent of the building that had been purchased for some months before a title had been given.

On the militia items Mr. MACKENZIE thought full explanation had not been given of the increase in the different items. The Hon. Minister of Militia had denied all idea of a standing army, but the maintenance of two batteries of Garrison Artillery was certainly a beginning of a permanent system. He asked whether the amount asked for the purchase of stores included everything, or whether stores had been purchased and the payment postponed for future years. He thought the total expenditure altogether too large and beyond our means.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the hon. member was specially entitled to full explanation as a most prominent militia officer. As to the stores, the cost of those which the Government had purchased amounted to about £170,000 sterling. He had tried to obtain 5 years to pay the money, but the Imperial Government would only allow three years, and the sums in the estimate included one-third of the total amount. The arms which had been taken to Manitoba by the volunteers would be left there. In addition to the 6,000 rifles purchased, the Government had offered to purchase and pay for in 5 years 25,000 Snider rifles, but the Imperial Government would not assent, and they, therefore, limited the purchase to the 6,000. Another reason of the increase was the amount to induce the men to remain in camp a longer period, and then there was the staff for British Columbia and Manitoba, and an increased expenditure had occurred in cloth-

ing, as that article had run short from constant wear and tear. As to the artillery, the services of Colonel French had been obtained to superintend the organization of the artillery. As to the two batteries, he certainly did not intend to form any permanent force. The necessity arose from the transfer to the Dominion Government of the fortifications at Toronto, Kingston, and the Island of St. Helen, Montreal, the stores there requiring constant care. If the fortifications were not properly cared for they would have to be dismantled. The batteries would be formed from the militia battalions in the district, and the men would not be appointed permanently, but a limited time only. The volunteers, men and officers, would have the chance of serving. Two thousand had been added to the total militia force in order to provide for Manitoba and British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had intended an amendment to the whole scheme, but it was too late to do so in consequence of the estimates being considered so late. He disapproved entirely of the whole scale of expenditure, and especially of what he regarded as an incipient step to the formation of a standing army in the items for field and garrison artillery, and he should call for a vote on those items.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said with regard to the Ordnance property transferred to the Government, the Government had already realized \$493,000 over and above all expenses from that property, and had still property at Toronto and Montreal to dispose of, which, in the course of years, might yield \$200,000 more.

Mr. DUFRESNE thought Canada should manufacture her own fire arms instead of purchasing.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER knew several parties in this country had succeeded in inventing very superior rifles, but the expense of starting a factory would be too great, especially as the arms had been purchased on such cheap terms.

Mr. POPE thought that the clothing could be furnished in Canada as well as in England.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the question had already engaged attention, and Colonel Powell in his report suggested that a large portion of the clothing could hereafter be obtained in Canada. Hitherto the difficulty had been, that although the cloth could be obtained as cheaply in Canada as elsewhere, the cost of making it up was much greater.

On the motion of Mr. HOLTON a vote was taken on the item of \$33,606 for ordnance and equipment for field batteries and garrison batteries of artillery.

Yeas, 63; nays, 19.

YEAS. — Messrs. Archambeault, Ault, Barthe, Bellerose, Blanchet, Bowell, Bown, Brousseau, Brown, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier (Sir Geo. E.), Cartwright, Costigan, Currier, DeLorme (Provencher), Drew, Dufresne, Dunkin, Ferguson, Forbes, Fortin, Galt (Sir Alexander T.), Gaucher, Gaudet, Gendron, Gibbs, Grover, Heath, Hincks (Sir Francis), Howe, Hurdon, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, Lapum, Lawson, McDonald (Lunenbourg), Masson (Soulanges), Masson (Terrebonne), Moffatt, Morris, Perry, Ray, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Victoria, N. S.), Ryan (King's N. B.), Schultz, Simard, Simpson, Stephenson, Street, Tilley, Tupper, Walsh, White (East Hastings), Willson, and Wright (Ottawa County).— 63.

NAYS.— Messrs. Blake, Bourassa, Cheval, Delorme (St. Hyacinthe), Dorion, Godin, Holton, Macdonald (Glengarry), Mackenzie, McDougall (Lanark), Mills, Morison (Victoria O.) Oliver, Paquet, Pozer, Ross (Wellington C. R.), Stirton, Wood, and Young — 19.

The item of \$75,000 for pay, maintenance, and equipment of two batteries of garrison artillery for garrison duty, was then declared carried on the same division, and the items for militia were concurred in.

It being 6 o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS.

Concurrence in the report of the Committee of Supply was resumed and the following items were carried:

Civil Government.	\$493.33
Legislation.	799.93
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	100,000.00
Ocean and River Steam service	19,600.00
Militia [extraordinary]	25,160.38
Lighthouse and Coast service .	22,830.00
Fisheries.	21,500.00

In reply to Mr. Mackenzie,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER stated the honorable gentleman would, on reflection, assent to this item of \$1200 for the representatives of the late Mr. T. D. McGee, "the equivalent of one year's pension formerly paid her." This lady was granted \$1,200 a year, and each child an absolute gift of £1000. The notion was that this pension would supplement the small donations to her children, and that being a comparatively young woman they would enjoy this pension some years. She had died suddenly, however, disappointing this expectation, when it was thought but right to grant the children this modest sum. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said if this expenditure was not to be continued, he thought it very proper to pay the amount.

Hon. Mr. Holton.

The item was carried.

The following under the head of "Miscellaneous" were carried without discussion:—

To pay Dame Angelique Leduc, widow of the late J. Bte. Normand, for damages to certain property held by her, occasioned by the construction of the Dam at the head of the Beauharnois Canal.	\$187.00
To pay the widow of the late Henry Traill, formerly a guard of the Kingston Penitentiary, who was murdered, whilst in execution of his duties, by two convicts, Smith and Mann ...	1,000.00
To pay Mrs. Moylan, widow of the late G. T. Moylan, Railway Mail Clerk, who died from injuries received from a fall from a Post Office car on the Grand Trunk Railway, between Grafton and Cobourg, whilst in execution of his duties.	600.00
To pay balance of expenses of the Civil Service Commission.	3,269.53
To pay the family of the late Capt. O'Brien, of the Schooner <i>Ocean Traveller</i> , lost in October last, whilst on the Sable Island Humane Establishment service.	600.00
To pay the families of the crew of the <i>Ocean Traveller</i>	1,000.00
To re-imburse Messrs. Gibbons, Burchill & Connell, of Sydney, Cape Breton, expenses incurred by them in procuring medical aid for three men employed in the month of December, 1869, in carrying supplies to Flint Island Lighthouse, but who were carried out to sea, and suffered exposure for nine days.	350.00
To pay the three men mentioned in the above vote, two of whom were so severely frost bitten, that their limbs had to be amputated, and who are consequently cripples for life.	600.00
To pay the Customs Department amount paid by the Collector, Halifax, Nova Scotia, for Boatmen's services, in connection with the Board of Health, Halifax, for half year ended 31st December, 1867.	1,104.00
To pay the estimated cost of removing depreciated Coin in the Province of Nova Scotia [the unexpended balance of the Vote to be carried forward to 1871-72]	40,000.00

On the item to provide for compensation to sufferers by the Insurrection in Rupert's Land in 1869-70, claims for loss of property, or for imprisonment, or for forced emigration from the Territory, to be proved before the Recorder of Manitoba, or any Commissioners appointed for that purpose by the Governor, and afterwards referred to the Treasury Board, and approved by Order in Council (the unexpended balance to be held over till 1871-72, \$40,000).

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explanations.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said all the claims had not yet been presented, and many which had already been examined were found to be inadmissible. *Bona fide* claims for imprisonment or actual loss of any kind would be paid.

Mr. SCATCHERD thought this country should not be called upon to pay these claims. The half-breeds of Manitoba, who had caused these troubles and losses should be taxed to pay them. The lands which had been granted them should be sold, if necessary, to cover these losses. No doubt this vote would be followed by one next year to indemnify the Hudson's Bay Co. for similar claims.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS said these claims which this money was voted to meet, were very different from those of the Hudson's Bay Co. No doubt the company had presented claims to this Government, but they had not been settled. He believed if the Imperial Government would settle them, this Government might well pay this small amount to the sufferers by the rebellion at Red River. He deprecated the idea of using the lands granted to the half-breeds, for the purpose.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought that the original error of the Government was in failing to assert from the commencement that the Imperial Government alone was responsible for the peaceable transfer of the North West to Canada. It was too late to take that ground now, for the whole affair had been practically treated as a Canadian one. He was therefore disposed to give his support to this appropriation.

Mr. BOWELL desired to call the attention of the Government to the wording of this paragraph. By it all classes could make claims under it. Even the Hudson's Bay Companies Officials in that country could make claims under it, and these parties, to his mind, were more responsible for the troubles in Ruperts Land, than any one else, and in his opinion, they were the parties who should be made to pay these losses, and not Canada. If, however, the claims of the loyalists were to be paid, great care should be taken that these

payments should not be quoted as a precedent upon which others who were not loyal, could make claims. He did not wish to have another Rebellion Losses Bill to stir up the animosity and ill feeling that existed in the country some years ago. It might be true that the present men in power did not intend to pay any of the Hudson's Bay Officials, but they had no certain lease of power, and the Opposition might if they obtained possession of the Government Benches, go beyond the intentions of the present men in power, and for the sake of securing support, might pay them (laughter). Under the paragraph there was nothing to prevent Riel from coming back and claiming an indemnity.

A VOICE—Yes, a rope.

Mr. BOWELL doubted from what had taken place in that country whether the fear of a rope would keep him out of the country. He thought that the claims ought not to be admitted without reservation. He, however, did not think the people of Manitoba should be taxed, thereby sending a firebrand into that country which it might be difficult to extinguish. He looked upon any claim by the Hudson's Bay Company as a mere piece of impudence, inasmuch as they had, in his opinion, been instrumental in causing the insurrection.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS did not acknowledge any right or liability whatever towards the Hudson's Bay Company in reference to any claims which they might submit.

Mr. BLAKE—He knew that well enough. He was acting merely for party purposes.

Mr. BOWELL—It comes with exceedingly bad grace from the hon. member for West Durham, to attribute party motives to any member, in the discharge of what he conceives to be a public duty. There is no man in the House more sensitive than he when motives are attributed to him, or even hinted at. Yet there is no man who had prostituted greater abilities for petty party triumphs oftener than that hon. gentleman. What right had he to charge him [Mr. Bowell] with being insincere in this matter. Had he not upon every occasion voted against the Government upon their Red River policy [hear, hear]. When this question was before the House during the last session, the member for West Durham found it convenient to be absent, attending to his own personal and pecuniary interests and neglecting those of the country. Why was he not then in his place? Did he see looming up in the distance, a question upon which he could agitate the whole of the people of Ontario [hear, hear]? Was it because he wished

to have the power at his command to inflame the worst passions of human nature when he could turn it to profitable political account? Was it for this reason that he studiously avoided at the command of his political master and controller in Toronto attending any of the indignation meetings held in that city? Who that has watched his course in this House, and witnessed the exhibition in the Ontario Legislature during the last Session, but must have come to the conclusion that his whole course has been one of purely party tactics [hear, hear]. Here when it was first discussed last year, he was conveniently absent and during the present discussion both he and his leader, the member for Lambton, had been as quiet as lambs neither of them had raised their voices, until goaded on to do so by their opponents, and then the mildness and gentleness with which the member for Durham had touched the subject was truly amazing when compared with the manner in which he fulminated his thunders at every one who dared to think differently from him, in the Legislative Hall at Toronto [hear, hear]. Here he pretends it would be useless to bring the subject of Scott's murder before the House because he would not carry a motion similar to the one he had introduced into the Legislature at Toronto, when surrounded by an Ontario and protestant audience [hear, hear].

Mr. BLAKE—I did not say that.

Mr. BOWELL—No, you did not say protestant, but that is what you meant. There you succeeded in arousing the prejudices of a certain class of the people who were honest in their feelings of indignation at that murder, and thought you were sincere not knowing by what feelings you were actuated. But now the elections are over in Ontario, and having made an agreement with a certain class of people not to discuss this question further, and knowing that your political allies in this House from Quebec would vote against you to a man, you have found it convenient to keep quiet and push forward another to do what you had not the courage to do yourself. He forsooth to accuse any one of being actuated by party motives. Why this question has been the stalking horse in every election contest in Ontario by the member for Durham, and his partizans [no, no]? The member for Durham says no, no, yet such is the fact. Likenesses of poor Scott have been hawked about among the electors in one hand, and Blake's resolution in the other to influence men in their vote. The portals of the grave have been opened, and the dust of the martyred dead dragged forth

to do the works of such politicians as the member for Durham. Crocodile tears have been copiously shed, and affected tears wiped from where none existed, in order to carry the Ontario elections. The hon. member knew well that the people of that Province were excited and indignant at the thought that no action had been taken to bring to justice these murderers, and that all that was wanted was to put a match to the inflammable matter and that a conflagration would ensue. He did it, he profited by it, and now he wishes to play the moderate man, and that to in the very place where he knows, action should be taken if taken at all. He knew well that a local legislature had no power to deal with a question affecting the administration of justice in another Province. Yet, with all this assumption of political honesty he did not hesitate to drag it before a body of men, and a court that he knew had no jurisdiction, and all to affect the elections, and now he arrogates the right to himself to lecture others upon their honesty, and to charge them with insincerity.

Mr. HOLTON rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman was wandering from the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER said that he failed to see the connection between the Speaker's remarks and the item before the House.

Mr. BOWELL bowed to the Speaker's decision, but thought he was justified in repelling the insinuation of the member for West Durham and to point out that being politically dishonest himself he did not hesitate to accuse others of the same fault. He observed also that the hon. gentleman who was designated the point of order of the House was not so strict with those who sat behind him. He then went back to the resolution, and concluded by saying that some expression should be contained in the resolution excluding the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company. But as the Government had pledged their word their parties would not be paid, he would waive that point, and content himself with moving that the following provision be added to the said resolution:—“Provided that this House in voting \$40,000 to provide for compensation to sufferers by the insurrection in Rupert's Land in 1869-70, claims from loss of property, or for imprisonment, or for forced emigration from the territory, does so upon the understanding that steps shall be taken by the Government of Canada, by Address to the Queen, or otherwise, to bring to trial those persons who were in any way connected with, or accessory to the cold blooded murder, for his outspoken loyalty to the Queen, of Thomas Scott, lately a resident of this Province,

Mr. Bowell.

and an emigrant thence to the North West."

Mr. D. A. SMITH wished to explain that he would like that a full investigation should be made into all the circumstances connected with the rebellion in the North West. It was due to the people of the North West and the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company who had been so greatly maligned in connection with this affair.

Dr. SCHULTZ.—I would willingly have avoided any discussion of the matter which now occupies the attention of this House. I would have avoided it, because everything connected with recent events in Manitoba has been to me of so painful a nature that now that we have better and brighter prospects, I would willingly have allowed the whole matter to have remained untouched. Still, I find in my newly undertaken duties that one's personal feelings must not always be consulted, but that the interests of the people he represents, and of the Country at large must be considered first, and the observations of the hon. gentleman from North Hastings, are such as call from me, as one of the Representatives from Manitoba, all the information I possess on one, and the principal point which he has adduced, namely the complicity of the Hudson Bay Co., or rather of a portion of their officers with the unhappy Rebellion of last winter. I am aware Mr. Speaker that the views which I shall advance in regard to the origin of Red River difficulty, and the substance of the documents which I shall read in support of these views, may differ materially from those generally entertained in some parts of this Dominion, yet I advance them with the full belief that they are concurred in, and indeed, openly expressed by nine tenths of that portion of the people of Manitoba, unconnected with the Rebellion itself, or with the Hudson's Bay Company. It might, at first sight, Sir, appear strange that a Corporation who had lately surrendered their rights to the North West Territory, who had received what might be considered a fair compensation for that surrender, and who, moreover, still retained a very considerable landed interest in that Territory, could have any possible reason for desiring anything but the prosperity, the advancement, and the peace of the country. Indeed it was generally advanced as a reason for allowing them to retain one-twentieth of the land, that this concession would bind their interests to ours, and be the means of allaying any possible source of discontent. But, sir, to properly understand the bearing of this question, it is necessary for the hon. members of this House, to bear in mind that there are two elements in the composition of the Hudson

Bay Company, namely: The Stockholders of that corporation, and its managing partners in the country. So long as the Company confined its attention to the collection of furs—so long these elements were in accord, and the immense profits, which in former times were made, were fairly divided between the Stockholders, who had advanced the money necessary to carry on the business, and those who had in the country, the care, the danger, and the labor of the trade. Hence it was that while the Stockholder who assumed territorial, as well as trading rights, would sometimes admit, that the country was fitted to be something better than a preserve for fur bearing animals, that concession was rarely, if ever, made by one of the inland officers, whose profit was derived solely from the fur trade, and whose right to participation in any other source of profit was disputed, if it was not entirely ignored by the stockholders.

It will be readily seen, then, Mr. Speaker that there was in such a union of diverse interests, the elements of discord, and this became apparent as soon as the Stockholders consented to entertain a proposition for the purchase of their territorial rights by this country. While the stockholders could see in the large sum to be paid for rights which were then in dispute, an ample compensation for the gradual but inevitable destruction of the fur trade profits which must follow, the inland fur trading officer saw in it only his own ultimate ruin, and opposed the project with all the power he possessed, and when the bargain had been concluded, he felt that Canada had accomplished his ruin by the purchase she had made, and that the stockholders had unfairly dealt with him in refusing him a portion of the compensation they themselves had received. Men so circumstanced, sir, are usually ready for rash and even violent action, and we find the first evidence of this at the annual meeting of the officers at Norway House, held a short time after the conclusion of the negotiations, and a few months before the emeute at Red River.

The following description which I found in one of the respectable journals of the Dominion will, if its evidence may be trusted, show the state of feeling which prevailed:—

"One of the causes of dissatisfaction amongst the Hudson Bay Company's officials in the North West is this: they say that the £300,000 to be paid the Company by the Canadian Government, will be pocketed by the English shareholders, and that not one copper of it will ever be seen by the traders in this country. No doubt they are perfectly right in this view; when the English shareholders get hold of the money they will very likely hold on to it. But the traders of the Nor' West proposed a game a little while ago which, if carried out, would more than make up to them the share of the £300,000,

which, they say, the English shareholders intended robbing them of. At a meeting of the Council of Rupert's Land—the body which controls the Company's affairs in the territory, a motion was submitted by one of the Chief Factors, proposing that they should secrete for their special use and benefit, furs to the value of £40,000 to be divided amongst the factors and those interested, just as soon as it should be clearly shown that the English shareholders intended gobbling up the whole of the Canadian purchase money. A lengthy and animated discussion took place on this exceedingly dishonest proposition, after which the motion being put, it was lost simply by the casting vote of the Chairman."

Now, Sir, this account may or may not be exactly correct, but *it is true* that a wide-spread and deep disaffection prevailed and the most violent language and even threats were used towards this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it has been argued that we had rebellion at Red River because we did not first consult the feelings and wishes of the people of that region. Well, I can only say that you will rarely hear that explanation attempted at Red River. Why, sir, I have myself seen on petitions praying for annexation to Canada many of the names of those who were foremost in endeavouring to prevent that union, and if it had been that this was really the cause we would, I think, have found all classes joining in it, instead of its being confined to that portion of the population who had the least property at stake and to the friends and sympathizers of the Hudson Bay Company.

Now, if we assume that the officers of the Hudson Bay Company at Fort Garry were anxious, or even willing, that Canada should possess the North West Territory we find it utterly impossible to explain the fact of their criminal inaction, their advice to Governor McDougall to leave the territory, their surrender of their Fort, their advice to the people to join the Provisional Government of President Riel. But if we assume their complicity in the matter, we can readily understand the prevalent belief among the loyal people, both English and French, of Manitoba, that the disaffection and dissatisfaction of the Hudson Bay Company's officers, the disappointment of Governor MacTavish at not being appointed Governor, caused them to hope that with Riel as their tool and agent they could keep out the Governor, disgust Canada with her bargain, and keep the country for some years longer, a reserve for fur bearing animals with the consequent extension of the fur trading profits. That they purposed taking steps which would lead to robbery, and end in murder, I am not prepared to state, but the general belief is that with Governor McDougall turned back, and with a Hudson Bay Co. officer at the head of a Provisional Government they could have forced Canada into an arrangement

more suitable to themselves even if less profitable to shareholders. However, this may be, I have not risen to make statements on my own responsibility. I will read to the house a number of affidavits bearing on the matter, and although I could say much from my own knowledge that is relative and corroborative, yet I refrain, and leave hon. gentlemen to what opinion they deem fit from the evidence I present. As for myself, I shall be glad if they are able to do so, yet, until that body can show that their responsible officers acted as loyal men should act under similar circumstances. I cannot consent to their receiving one penny of the money of this Dominion.

The first statement bearing upon the subject is that of Sgt. James Mulligan, a Pensioner of Her Majesty's 17th Foot and lately and for some time Chief of the Police Force in the Town of Winnipeg. Sgt. Mulligan being duly sworn before one of the recently appointed Manitoba Justices of the Peace states among other things.

"That hearing that the buildings of Dr. Schultz were threatened with a consequent danger of fire extending to the town, said James Mulligan, then Chief of Police, proceeded at once to Fort Garry, and spoke to Chief Factor Dr. Cowan, who was a Justice of the Peace and in charge of Fort Garry, told him what he, the said Mulligan, had heard. Said Mulligan urged said Cowan to take steps to prevent such an outrage, and asked for instructions how to proceed. Cowan answered, what can we do? Said Mulligan replied that it would be advisable to call out the 300 special constables who had been engaged. Said Cowan refused to do so, and said Mulligan returned to take what precautions he could with the two policemen under his charge. Said James Mulligan further says that before the rebels assembled at Stinking River, he gave due notice to said Justice Cowan of their intention to do so, and that the said Justice Cowan seemed to take no notice of it. That repeatedly afterwards up to the time of the Fort being occupied by Riel and his men, the said Mulligan did urge upon the said Cowan the danger in which the Fort stood, and a short time before did inform the said Cowan that the rebels meditated doing so immediately and again urged the said Cowan to call upon the said 300 special constables, but was in all cases distinctly refused. Said James Mulligan further says that a short time after the rebels had taken Fort Garry he went to said Fort with one Sergeant Major Power and requested an interview with Governor MacTavish, that he was told that Governor MacTavish was too sick to see anyone, but was referred by Dr. Cowan to Acting Governor Judge Black. To Judge Black the said James Mulligan said, I have come herewith Sergeant Major Power to request permission to raise the British Flag and to defend it. Judge Black asked him, how that could be done? Said Mulligan declared that he could call on the pensioners to the number of thirty and get as many more as he wanted from the loyal population. Said Black said, will see the Governor to-night, and we will see about it, and I will give you an answer to-morrow. On or about three o'clock on the following day the said Mulligan was informed that the request about the flag could not be granted, and that his services with pensioners and loyal men were not required. Said James Mulligan further says that on the 29th November, 1869 he did receive from Governor MacTavish an order in writing to procure the services of seven men and with them to guard certain Government stores

in the storehouse of Doctor Schultz, and that said order was issued in consequence of an urgent appeal for protection from Jno. A. Snow, the Agent of the Canadian Government at that time, that he did procure the said seven men and place them to guard the building, that he remained till the seventh day of December, when the buildings were surrounded by an armed force under Riel, and orders having come from Col. Dennis to surrender he was included, in the general capture, and remained for ten weeks in prison. Said Mulligan further states that after ten weeks imprisonment he went and saw Dr. Cowan, and asked to see Governor MacTavish, that he wished the pay of the men that he had employed to defend the Government stores. Said MacTavish raised all possible objections and said, to tell the truth Mulligan, Riel has deceived me, he promised that he would respect my guard, and he also promised me that he would remain only three days. Mulligan then said "you seem to have made a close bargain with Riel," which Governor MacTavish did not deny, and admitted in general terms that he had made a mistake in not calling upon the loyal people. Said Mulligan further says that a few days after the taking of Fort Garry by the rebels, he called upon Dr. Cowan and asked how these rebels were being fed and whether they had broken into any of the stores. Said Cowan said that they had not, but that he had given them access to the stores. Said James Mulligan finally says that he has been Chief of police in the town of Winnipeg for four years, and that he acted in that capacity during the whole of the rebellion until his own imprisonment on the 7th December, 1869. That he repeatedly warned Doctor Cowan and other of his superior officers of the rising and of the intention of the rebels to overthrow the Government and take Fort Garry, but that on all occasions he was rebuffed and all his offers of services on behalf of himself in the name of the loyal people who were willing to support the police authority and anxious to keep down the rebellion were distinctly refused, and that the said James Mulligan fully believes that the Hudson Bay Company authorities could at any time have stopped the said rebellion, but that they encouraged it for their own purposes and verily believes Riel and his men to have been invited to take possession of Fort Garry."

The next statement is one also upon oath made by a very respectable resident of the Parish of Kildonan who states.

"That during the fall of 1869 he was working in the vicinity of Fort Garry, and slept occasionally at the house of his sister in said Fort. That on one occasion, just before the gathering of rebels at Stinking River to resist the entrance of the Hon. Wm. McDougall into the Territory, ingoing out in the dusk of the evening he saw Louis Riel and Chief Factor Dr. Cowan enter Fort Garry by the South Gate, and not wishing to be seen, he, the said John Flett, did enter the porch leading to the Hudson Bay Company's store. That while in said porch the said Riel and said Cowan advanced and stopped about five yards from where he was. That he did distinctly hear this conversation which took place between the said Cowan and Riel. That it appeared from the remarks he heard as the said Cowan and Riel approached that said Cowan urged said Riel to go on with the proposed stopping of the Hon. Wm. McDougall at Stinking River. That said Riel replied, "What good will it do me? What will I get for it?" Said Cowan answered that Governor MacTavish would do as he had promised, and said Cowan also assured him, the said Riel, that he would get what he had been promised. That said Cowan and said Riel then walked in the direction of said Cowan's residence. That further, he verily believes from the whole conversation that said Cowan, who was then in charge of Fort Garry, was inciting and encouraging the said Riel by promises of payment to take active steps for the keeping out of the said Governor McDougall which said Riel seemed to hesitate about doing. That also, he did on several occasions see

the said Cowan and Riel in close conversation, but could not hear what was said.

Another and the last which I shall call the attention of this Honourable House to, is that a Gentleman who occupied an official position under the Hudson Bay Company for some years and may be supposed to have had considerable insight into the real state of affairs, states.

"That about four years ago he was commissioned by the Hon. Hudson Bay Company in England a member of the Council of Assiniboia and that he has been a Petit Magistrate and Collector of Customs for about ten years. That about one week before the erection of barricades at Stinking River, and when the rebels were then collecting at that place, he was summoned to attend a meeting of the said Council of Assiniboia to consider the state of affairs. That at said Council he warned the other members of the gathering near his place on the Stinking River, but that the President, Judge Black, then acting Governor, did not suggest or advise any active measures to prevent the evil. That he then urged upon the Council the necessity, and offered to raise among the loyal portion of his own people, the French half-breeds, enough men to put the gathering down. That on pressing the matter he was allowed to see what he could do in getting the names of persons willing to act in such service and to report. That he afterwards procured the names of ninety-six able-bodied men willing to act, and that the fact was duly reported, but that Governor MacTavish directed him to disband and pay off the force which he had gathered at the north side of the barricade to the number of fifty six without giving him any reason for doing so. That he requested and waited a day and a half on a written order, but that such order was distinctly refused. That there were on being estimated about sixty-six of the party under Riel and Bruce at the said barricade at Stinking River. That he asked Governor MacTavish for additional permission to call on the English people, but that request was refused. That afterwards, and a short time before Fort Garry was taken possession of by said rebels, he informed Dr. Cowan the master of said fort, of their intention of doing so, but that he did not advise or take any steps to prevent their doings, and that in his presence a prominent French half-breed informed Governor MacTavish of the intention of the rebels to take possession of the Hudson Bay Company's safe and of the Fort. That to the best of his knowledge and belief the officers of the Hudson Bay Company at Fort Garry did not wish to stop the action of the insurgents at Stinking River, and that had he been given authority to so it could easily have been accomplished with the aid of the French half-breeds alone. That the said officers discouraged and frowned down every suggestion of a means of doing so and refused all offers of aid and that he believes that for some private reason the movement of the insurgents under Riel, Bruce and Lepine was thoroughly in accord with their own wishes."

And now, Mr. Speaker, as regards that clause in the Supplementary Estimates, which asks this country for \$40,000 to relieve the sufferers from the recent rebellion at Red River. I may say that this is a point which specially pleases me. I am perfectly well aware that this government might, had it so chosen, waited to ask the country for an amount for this purpose, till an investigation had been made, till evidence had been taken, till a Commission had sat. Yet, without any undue pressure that I am aware of, they propose to spend this sum in this very laudable way, and I am disposed to look upon it, as an earnest, that the Government intends

to deal fairly, possibly even liberally with the loyal sufferers of last winter. I may say also now that we are discussing the subject, that at a time when this Government was accused of having no sympathy with the Red River loyalists they did that which saved me, at least, from utter ruin and inaugurated a principle which, by this clause in the supplementary estimates they seem determined to carry out. I have also since learned, Sir, that this relief to myself, which I speak of, was not afforded without a considerable stretch of legal authority, and that a Minister of the Crown even became personally responsible for the amount. Well, the conclusion that I feel forced to come to, after a considerable degree of doubt on this matter, is, that in this matter at least, the Government are not so utterly heartless as has sometimes been represented and if the indemnity proposed, be confined to these and these only, who are known to have lost their property or their time for the sake of loyalty to the Crown, it will tend to reassure that class of sufferers in Manitoba who now consider that they have been neglected and disregarded.—(Applause.)

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said none of the money would be paid to the Hudson's Bay Company under any circumstances.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said there was a distinction between the Company and the representatives of that Company.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said he included every one connected with the Company in the statement he had made.

The amendment was put and the vote taken as follows—Yeas 24, Nays 54.

YEAS.—Messrs. Bowell, Cartwright, Drew, Holmes, Hurdon, Jones (Leeds & Grenville), Macdonald (Glengarry), McDonald (Middlesex), Mackenzie, McDougall (Lanark), McMonies, Oliver, Perry, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Prince Edward), Ross (Wellington, C R.), Smith (Selkirk), Snider, Stephenson, Walsh, Wells, White (East Hastings), Willson and Wood.—24.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archangeault, Barthe, Bellerose, Benoit, Bourassa, Brousseau, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Peel), Caron, Cartier [Sir George E.] Cimon, Costigan, Crawford (Brockville), Currier, Daoust, Delorme [Provencher], Dufresne, Dunkin, Forbes, Fortin, Gaucher, Gendron, Godin, Gray, Heath, Hincks [Sir Francis], Holton, Howe, Keeler, Lacerte, Langevin, Langlois, McDonald (Lunenburg), Masson [Soulanges], Masson (Terrebonne), McDougall (Three Rivers), McKeagney, Mofatt, Morris, Morrison (Niagara), O'Connor, Pinsonneault, Pope, Ray, Robitaille, Ross (Champlain), Ross (Victoria N. S.), Shanly, Simard, Simpson, Street, Tilley, Tourangeau and Tupper.—54.

Dr. Schultz.

Item carried.

The following items were then carried:

Refund of duties to Goudierham & Worts.....	\$ 2309 34
Cost and damages in case of Kin- near Bros. vs. Robinson.....	8436 41
Canal Commission.....	10,000 00

On the item of \$200 000 to pay amount further required in connection with North West,

Mr. HOLTON asked for information as to the objects for which the vote was required.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said the original vote was intended for the organization of the North West and opening of communication and formation of Government. An expedition however was found necessary and a vote had to be asked, and the whole matter was so complicated that with every endeavour he was unable to say how the matter would stand at the end of the year.

He stated the cost of the Civil Government, the Public Works, and the Military Expedition, and said about \$100,000 more would be required for the Military Expedition. The only other expenditure would be in public works in opening communication this year and they found it necessary to ask another vote in order to give them a sufficient margin.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected that such an amount should be asked as a mere vote of credit without giving any particulars as to the work to be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for information as to the public works to be undertaken.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had already explained the nature of the work. There was a bridge on the road from Thunder Bay to Lake Shebandowan; gravel had to be laid on the road; some 25 miles of the road from the Lake of the Woods to Fort Garry would have to be completed; and dams would be erected to lighten the work at the portages.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked whether it was true that some change had taken place in the contracts for the construction of the steamer.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the contract was about \$35,000 and although some changes were made in the specifications the price was not changed.

Item carried.

The following items were passed after explanation by Hon. Mr. Tilley.

To pay Contingencies of the Port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1868.....	2,032 58
To pay the salaries of Preven- tive Officers and expenses at	

Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, for the three years, 1867-68, 1868-69, 1869-70.....	661 16
To pay the salary of the Seizing Officer, Canada Creek, Port of Cornwallis, Nova Scotia, from 1st July, 1867, to 30th June 1871, at \$40 per annum.....	169 00
To pay the salary of the Preventive Officer, Tusket Wedge Nova Scotia, for 1868-69 and 1869-70, at \$60 per annum.....	120 00
Also, without comment,—	
To pay the cost of Standard Weights and Measures and other expenses consequent on assimilation of Weights and Measures (the unexpended balance to be carried forward to the fiscal year, 1871-72)...	50,000 00
To pay Collectors' allowances, N. S. and N. B., on duties collected by them, estimated at.....	2,700 00
To pay for Mail Service in the Province of Manitoba, and for payment to the United States Post Office of Transit Rates for the conveyance of closed mails to and from Manitoba.....	6,000 00
Also, on explanation by Hon. Mr. Langevin,—	
European and North American Railway extension, working expenses.....	8,000 00
Maintenance, salaries of staff, &c., for the month of June, 1871.....	15,000 00
On the item of \$100,000 for survey in Manitoba, Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked for information.	

Hon. Mr. HOWE said the survey would be placed in the care of Colonel Dennis and would be pushed forward as rapidly as possible. A Commissioner would be sent to make arrangements with the Indian Tribes to allow the survey.

Item carried.

On the item of \$250,000 for survey and location of Pacific Railway,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for some particulars as to what would be done in this matter.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Government intended to instruct their Chief Engineer to survey for a railway from Lake Nipissing towards the Rocky Mountains. Of course nothing definite could be said beforehand, but the intention was to organize parties to act in different sections, and to ascertain the best pass through the Rocky mountains. On the other side of those mountains several routes would have to be surveyed, and the terminus would have

to be decided upon, so that many parties would have to be engaged on a reconnaissance so as to guide the Chief Engineer in the location of the road in the following season. He quoted the opinions of several engineers who favored Vancouver's Island as the terminus.

Mr. MACKENZIE asked for the names of the Engineers referred to.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said he had done his best to collect full information, but he did not think he was called upon to name his authorities.

Mr. MACKENZIE said when opinions were quoted, the authors of those opinions should be given.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON spoke to the same effect.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said that if reference had been made to a report of any one officially employed, of course the names should be given, but under the circumstances they were certainly not called for.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked whether the Government had appointed the Chief Engineer.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN did not think he was called on to name his informants. The vote was asked for the special purpose of obtaining proper information as to the route. It was admitted that if the terminus were at Vancouver's Island there would be a great difficulty in crossing from the mainland. This would be evident to any one who consulted a map, but he did not advocate any one line, as although much had been said and written, a proper survey had never been carried through. The Government had no selection for the office of Chief Engineer.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said that as the matter was simply a reconnaissance the word location should be struck out.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN assented.

Hon. Mr. WOOD asked whether Government could say what the entire cost of the Survey would ultimately amount to.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS.—No.

Item carried.

Mr. MACKENZIE said at the rate charged for the Survey of the Intercolonial the location of the Pacific would amount to over four millions of dollars, the exploratory survey alone would probably cost a million.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said it would be quite enough for the first year to survey from the Pacific Coast to the Rocky Mountains, and from Fort Garry to Lake Nipissing. He supposed the work was really to ascertain the practicability of the Railway at all. This was of course necessary to

induce a Company to take the work, but it was not necessary to make a Survey over a country where a line could be run at any place, as was the case for 1000 miles of the road.

On the item of \$40,000 for the construction of a new Post Office at Montreal, several questions were asked and replied to by the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked what was the area of the site. He believed it to be the best in Montreal, but he would like to know what was the price per foot.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN could not give the exact number of feet, but he described the extent of the lot, and said it would be understood by those who knew Montreal.

Item carried.

Item of \$200,000 for raising the banks of the Welland Canal, and \$150,000 for Grenville Canal Locks.—Carried.

On the item of \$100,000 for improving the channel of the St. Lawrence between Kingston and Montreal,

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) asked at what points the improvements were to be made.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the report on the subject shewed that there were several points at which there was a very small depth, and it was intended to make a depth to allow vessels drawing eight or nine feet of water to pass.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) said he was as anxious as any one could be to have the navigation of the St. Lawrence improved, but he disapproved of this system of coming down to the House and asking for an appropriation for the purpose without being able to give estimates of the cost of engineering, &c.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON had every confidence in Mr. Page, the engineer of the Department, and was willing to vote for the appropriation if that gentleman recommended that it should be made.

The item was carried.

On the item of \$10,000 for the completion of Survey of Sault Ste. Marie canal,

Mr. MACKENZIE wished to know if the Canal Report already presented by Mr. Kilally was not sufficient.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the report referred to was Mr. Keefer's. The depth of water on the sill recommended by him was nine feet.

Mr. MACKENZIE—That would never do.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN thought so too. The Canal Commissioners recommended twelve feet on the sills and other improvements on which Mr. Keefer had not reported, and it was thought proper to make this appropriation for a fresh survey.

Hon. Mr. Macdougall.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the regular staff of the Department ought to be sufficiently large to attend to this trifling matter.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the staff was already fully employed. They were still engaged in making the surveys ordered last session.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the distance to be surveyed was not over a mile and a half, the location was pleasant and easy of access, there was no great engineering difficulty to be overcome, and how \$10,000 were to be expended he could not understand.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said in former instances it had been found that such appropriations were not large enough. If any portion of this amount should not be required it would remain over unexpended.

Item carried.

On the item of \$6,000 for a bridge over the Rideau Canal, at Wellington Village, the Local authorities furnishing an equal amount,

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) asked for explanations.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the water had been raised by a dam erected by the Government, and the Canal was thus made some sixty feet broader. The cost of the bridge was proportionately increased, and the Government thought proper to bear a portion of the expense. Twelve thousand dollars would construct a draw-bridge.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) thought it would be better to expend a little more and erect a good fixed bridge sufficiently high to permit of the passage of vessels under it. He did not approve of these draw bridges, which required officers to look after them.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON did not think this House should be called upon to vote money to aid in constructing a purely Local work.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said the Canal was a public work, maintained for the benefit of the whole country, and while it was so maintained, it was the duty of the Government to aid in constructing bridges in places where, but for the existence of the Canal, they would not be required. In reply to the hon. member for Glengarry, he would simply say that he was not certain what kind of a bridge would be built, but a fixed bridge would be constructed if possible.

Mr. CURRIER said the banks of the river at the place were low, and it would cost a large sum to construct a fixed bridge sufficiently high to permit vessels to pass under it.

Mr. MACKENZIE wished to know if it

were true that it was a river and not a canal that it was proposed to bridge.

Mr. CURRIER.—At the place, the river is the canal.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said in consequence of the construction of the dam the breadth of the water had been so greatly increased that it would be unfair to expect the local Corporation to build the bridge alone.

Item carried.

The item of \$297,500, for Public Buildings, was carried without discussion.

On the item \$76,950, for Harbours and Piers,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON protested against bringing down these estimates for local expenditures near the close of the Session, when nearly all the members were away.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the reports of the engineers who had made these surveys reached him too late to place these appropriations in the general estimates. None of the gentlemen representing constituencies in which these appropriations were to be expended knew anything about it till they saw the items in the supplementary estimates: In reply to Mr. Holton he said that very little, if any, revenue need be expected from these Harbours of Refuge on the coast of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. member should give some explanation respecting the appropriation for a Harbour of Refuge at Liverpool, N.S. If his (Mr. Mackenzie's) information was correct, the coast was deeply indented with bays, while at Liverpool the place was exceedingly unfavorable for being converted into a Harbour of Refuge. Did the engineer recommend the construction of a Harbour of Refuge at this point?

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN.—Yes.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that several lives and a large number of vessels had been lost at the place for want of a Harbour of Refuge.

Mr. MACKENZIE criticised the appropriations for Harbours and Piers. The item of \$1,650 for the completion and repairs of a pier in Digby Bay, N.S., he said, was merely for the purpose of building a wharf to accommodate the people of Digby Village. It was a work which should be constructed by the local authorities, and should not be included in these estimates.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said it was an inter-provincial pier, from which a steamer started daily to the ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. MACKENZIE said there were hundreds of places in the Dominion which were as much entitled to receive public aid as Digby.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER.—The wharf is an asset of the Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it would be an advantage to the country if it were not. If there was one place more insignificant than another, from a commercial point of view, it was Digby, and if this appropriation were voted, every little hamlet on the coast of the Dominion would be expecting similar appropriations.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said this was an asset handed over to the Dominion by the local government at the Confederation of the provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE—It was built by the Dominion.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said he thought the hon. member was laboring under a misapprehension. The pier was built by the local government at a large cost, but being a point of inter-communication between the Provinces, and consequently, was handed over to the Dominion. This government could take possession of it at any moment and deprive the local authorities of the use of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE—If the hon. member will say he is serious, I will not say another word.

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—I am serious.

Mr. MACKENZIE—Then I am astonished (a laugh.)

Hon. Dr. TUPPER—The hon. member has broken his agreement.

Mr. MACDONALD (Glengarry) objected to this Dominion building a pier in the harbor.

Mr. McDONALD (Antigonish) said there was a better ground for making this appropriation than to expend money on Canals, Slides, and Booms, in Ontario.

Mr. MACKENZIE—But we derive a revenue from them.

Mr. McDONALD—Very little.

Mr. MACKENZIE assured the hon. member that the revenue derived from the works in Ontario, just referred to, was very considerable. The revenue from the Welland Canal was from six to seven per cent., and from the Slides and Booms, two and a half per cent.

Mr. McDONALD (Antigonish) thought it unfair that these appropriations for Nova Scotia should be objected to on all occasions.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he objected to this vote on its merits, and he was not to be deterred from expressing his opinion respecting it, through any threats of throwing Nova Scotia at his head.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said that all the arguments of the hon. members opposite,

could not explain away the fact this appropriation was for the completion and repair of a village wharf. The same could be said of the vote for aiding in the construction of a wharf at *Rivière du Loup en Haut*.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said in the latter case the appropriation was not for the construction of a village wharf. It was for the purpose of aiding the Local authorities to cut through a bar at the mouth of the river which would make the stream navigable for some distance up.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said this discussion was similar to the wrangles on Local appropriations in the Parliament of Old Canada. It was found necessary to make appropriations for none but works of a public nature, in order to get rid of the sectional feelings which votes for Local works were sure to engender. He regretted to see that the Government were adopting the old system, which, unless checked at once, would lead to fresh struggles between the Provinces. He was opposed to these supplementary estimates, and he believed in England they were looked upon as immoral in their tendency. The system recently adopted there, was to include all excepting the estimates which were absolutely necessary in the general estimates.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said the system adopted by this Government during the present session was a new one, but then the circumstances were new too. A number of the members from Nova Scotia who formerly opposed the Government were now numbered amongst their supporters.

The item was carried.

The following items were carried without discussion:

Legislation	\$ 1,250 00
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.	50,000 00
Immigration and Quarantine...	7,500 00
Penitentiaries	14,000 00
Light house and coast service...	20,950 00
To pay expenses connected with organising and carrying on Government in British Columbia (in addition to revenue received therein).....	125,000 00
To pay one half of the cost of surveying boundary line between Ontario and the North West Territories.....	15,000 00
Cost of printing Proclamations and Orders in Council to carry out laws.....	5,000 00
Inland Revenue.....	2,700 00
Post Office.....	12,500 00

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN, in reply to Mr. MacKenzie, explained that this latter appropriation was made for establishing a mail service through our own territory to Fort Garry.

Hon. Mr. Holtton.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he was glad to know that such an arrangement had been arrived at (hear, hear.) It was anything but dignified for this country to be obliged to depend on our neighbors to carry our mails from one part of the Dominion to another.

This concluded the supplementary estimates.

Mr. STREET presented the seventh report of the Library Committee.

STATUE OF HER MAJESTY, &c.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved the following resolution: "That the authority of this House be given for the purchase by the Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament for the Library at such prices as they may deem advisable, of Mr. Marshall Wood's statues of Her Majesty and the busts of their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, and charge such price against the appropriation for unforeseen expenses for the current year." He explained that His Excellency approved of the resolution.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON asked for explanations respecting the statue of Her Majesty in the Senate Chamber.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said he understood that Mr. Marshall Wood had brought them out, and the statue of Her Majesty had been placed in the Senate Chamber where it could be inspected by the members of this Parliament.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said he understood that the statue had been taken possession of by the Board of Works on its arrival here and placed in the Senate by them. He protested against this irregular act on the part of the Government, and the position in which the House had been placed.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN said that the hon. member was mistaken. The Board of Works had not taken possession of the statue. Mr. Wood had asked leave to place the statue in the Senate, and leave had been granted him to do so. The Board of Works sent some of their men to aid him in placing it there.

Mr. MACKENZIE called attention to the bungling manner in which the employees of the Board of Works had managed to place the statue in the Senate. Everyone united with him in condemning the manner in which it had been mutilated through their incompetence. He would call attention to another matter. Since the opening of this session, members of this House found it impossible to obtain tickets of entrance to the Senate without begging them from the Speaker

of the Senate or His Majesty the Usher of the Black Rod. He (Mr. Mackenzie) resented this indignity to this House, for while members of the commons were refused tickets, the Usher of the Black Rod was distributing them freely among his friends in the city.

In reply to Hon. Mr. Holton,

Hon. Dr. TUPPER said that the Minister of Justice saw the statues which were brought out from England, and had led Mr. Wood, the artist, to understand that if they were brought to Ottawa, this Parliament would not refuse to purchase them.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the proper place for the statues was not the Senate Chamber, but the Library.

The House went into Committee on the resolution, and passed it without discussion.

The Supply Bill was introduced in the usual formal manner, and read a first time.

The following measures were passed through the final stages.

BILLS PASSED.

An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba, certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion, (from Senate).

An Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba, and to British Columbia, so soon as it shall become a Province of the Dominion, certain Acts and parts of Acts of the Parliament of Canada.

An Act to amend the Railway Act of 1868, in which are inserted certain provisions of the Bill (No. 21) to amend the Railway Act of 1868, and of the Bill (No. 8) to amend "The Railway Act of 1868," and to extend the same.

Bills Nos. 12 and 23 to amend the Act 31 Vict., cap. 66, respecting Aliens and Naturalization (and Amendments).

An Act to make provision for the detention of female convicts in Reformatory Prisons in the Province of Quebec.

POWER OF PARLIAMENT.

The following resolution was passed through Committee and read a second and third time:—

"To consider certain Resolutions for an Address to Her Majesty on the subject of the draft of a Bill intended for submission to the Imperial Parliament, for the purpose of removing doubts which may have been entertained respecting the powers of the Parliament of Canada, to establish Provinces in Territories admitted, or which may hereafter be admitted into the Dominion of Canada, and to provide for the representation of such Provinces in the said

Parliament, and vesting such powers in the said Parliament.

House adjourned at 2 a. m. till 3 p. m.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, 13th April, 1871.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 11 o'clock.

A number of Bills were passed and sent to the Commons.

The House adjourned at half-past one, and re-assembled at three, when a large amount of business was transacted.

The House adjourned at six and resumed at eight o'clock.

All the business on this day was of a routine character, for which see Journals of Senate.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th April, 1871.

After routine,

THE JOINT HIGH COMMISSION.

In reply to the Hon. Mr. HOLTON'S question as to whether any information could with propriety be furnished to the House as to the proceedings of the Joint High Commission, so far as they affected the public business,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Government were not in a position to give any information as to the proceedings of the Joint High Commission.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

In reply to Mr. CARTWRIGHT as to whether the resolution respecting the construction of the Pacific Railway adopted by the House the other day had been transmitted to the British Columbia Government,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER replied that there was no necessity to communicate it, though possibly it might form the subject of a despatch if the Governor General should think it advisable to do so.

PERSONAL ATTACK.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said as this was the last day of the session he wished to call attention to an attack made upon him in a former debate by the hon. member for Lambton. That hon. gentleman at some public meetings which he had attended in the West, had repeated some of the stories circulated to his prejudice last

year, and assailed him personally in his absence. He had taken no notice of these slanders, but the member for Lambton while he was ill and confined to his house, made a stab at his vacant chair and hazarded a statement to which he desired to give a flat contradiction. The words, as taken down by the Hon. Minister of Customs, were that he (Mr. Howe) in the North West—referring to the British flag then flying over a house—had given orders to “Take down that rag,” and had “wished to God that the Yankees had the whole country.” As the hon. Member for Lambton was not in his seat, and as he understood, had returned to his home, he should make no further comment upon his conduct than to say that the language attributed to him was a low invention and a disreputable falsehood.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON desired to say on behalf of the hon. member for Lambton, who would not be in his seat again this session, that it was unfortunate that this matter had not been brought up earlier in the session in order that the hon. member for Lambton might either make good his statement, or if it should be proved to be unfounded, that he might withdraw the charge. He (Mr. Holton) was sure that the hon. gentleman, if present, would do either one thing or the other, for no member in the house was more candid in correcting an error which he might make in the heat of a debate. Of course he (Mr. Holton) did not attempt to substantiate the statement of his hon. friend, he merely rose to say that it was a pity the matter had not been referred to earlier in the session.

Hon. Mr. HOWE said his intention was to have replied to it the moment he entered the House and took his seat, but at the suggestion of his colleagues, he left it over in the expectation that when the hon. member for Lambton should rise at the close of the session to make his usual criticism on the course of the Government a chance would be given to him (Mr. Howe,) to refer to this matter, without interruption to the progress of public business.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS said if his memory served him right the very statement was made in the House last session and the truth of it distinctly denied by the Hon. Secretary of State for the Provinces.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said that he had telegraphed to James Turner, a merchant in Hamilton who had been the intimate companion of the Hon. Secretary of State while in Red River on the occasion referred to, and had received a telegram in reply which stated that there was not a word of

truth in the statement respecting the flag, nor did he believe such words had ever been used by the Secretary of State, nor did that hon. gentleman ever do or say anything while in the North West to give foundation to the rumour.

Mr. DONALD A. SMITH said he had heard the rumor but he had never yet been able to find one individual who had heard the Secretary of State make use of the disloyal words attributed to him. On the contrary he (Smith) had heard that the hon. gentleman had advised the people of the North West not to stand up for supposed rights but to go in and make the best of the connection with Canada.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said in justice to the hon. member for Lambton, that the hon. gentleman was justified, not in using the expressions quoted, but in saying that such language was reported to have been used, for there were several gentlemen from Red River who asserted that it was so. If the Hon. Secretary of State denied that he had used such words he (Macdougall) should be very loth to doubt the denial even in such a critical case as this. But there was a circumstance which the hon. member had admitted, viz, that a flag was raised on a pole near the residence of Dr. Schultz; that it was a British flag and with the word Canada, and that some question having been raised as to whether it should be raised or not, the Hon. Secretary of State had said it should not. So it would not do to deny the statement of the hon. member for Lambton in the absolute and unqualified manner in which the Secretary of State had done. He (Mr. Macdougall) had submitted in silence to many an attack on himself, personally, during this session, to which he could easily have replied, but he had refrained from doing so, feeling that it was to the interest of all parties, and feeling that it was his duty as a Canadian and a public man not to add to the irritation and ill-feeling which the events in the North West had excited in our midst. He did not desire to awaken reminiscences, but he would say that looking to the past career of the Hon. Secretary of State, and remembering that he was an old man failing in health, he [Mr. Macdougall] had rather a feeling of sympathy than otherwise towards the hon. gentleman and was disposed to forget the past [hear, hear].

Hon. Mr. HOWE said he was an old politician and was accustomed to hard knocks, but he would say that he regretted that the hon. member for North Lanark should have allowed himself for a moment to take up floating rumours at a time, no doubt, when the hon. member was

Hon. Mr. Howe.

placed in a position and surrounded by circumstances calculated to create irritation. He regretted that the hon. member should have done this and entertained hard feelings against an old friend and colleague, without better foundation. If the hon. gentleman had come to him (Mr. Howe) and said, "Did you do this or that," he would have frankly explained on the instant, not only his own conduct, but the part he had taken in public affairs in which they were both mixed up at that time. It was due to himself to say that he (Mr. Howe) urged upon the hon. gentleman to accept the governorship of the North West, and from the time that he [Mr. Howe] parted with the hon. member on Lake Superior till he returned to Ottawa, his defence and support of the hon. member's personal and public character, whenever assailed, was loyal and true, and he declared that until he found himself assailed in a most unfair, and what he conceived, a most ungenerous manner by the hon. member for Lanark—until that time, he [Mr. Howe] had never entertained anything but a feeling of friendship for the hon. gentleman [hear, hear]. With regard to what took place in the House during the discussion on this matter last session, he [Mr. Howe] did not remember what explanation he had made, but this was the statement that he would now make. He saw the flag with the word "Canada" on it, but he never presumed to give orders as to whether it should be taken down or not. He referred to his forty years of public life, to his speeches and writings in proof that he had never at any time uttered a word which could be construed into disloyalty. On the contrary, in public meetings both in this country and in the United States, he had always spoken with pride of the connection of this country with Great Britain. His own history and his family history were the best evidences of his loyalty to Britain [cheers].

LANDS IN MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he was willing to withdraw his proposed regulations respecting lands in Manitoba, as the Government had expressed their readiness to adopt the most important of them.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) asked whether the Government would modify the Manitoba regulations, to extend the grant of lands to old settlers of 1812, 1820, who were not half-breeds, but of English and Scotch birth and parentage. These men had done a good deal of service to the country and had helped to form the community, and were entitled to as liberal treatment as their children the half-breeds. He

hoped Government would accept this suggestion.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER explained the effect of the Act as to the distribution of lands to the half-breeds, and that Government could not depart from its previous decision.

Mr. FERGUSON had hoped that the Government would have imposed settlement duties. The half-breeds were no mere roving tribes, and ought to perform the same settlement duties as emigrants. He was told that 163 acres would come to each person, but the member for Lisgar told him they would not get more than 120 acres, but under any circumstances they ought to be governed by the same regulations as other emigrants, in order to prevent them from disposing of their lands to mere speculators for a small amount of cash. He moved a resolution providing settlement duties on the Indian lands.

Hon. Sir G. E. CARTIER said he hoped the motion would not be pressed. The Government could not now impose settlement duties as a great number of those entitled to the lands under the Act were children. Until the children came of age the Government were the guardians of the land, and no speculators would be suffered to get hold of it. The regulations could be altered from time to time if necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON said he would not have pressed the question if he thought he could have avoided, but as it was distinctly provided that no settlement duties were required, he must try to amend it. If it was intended that no speculators should get hold of the land, steps should be taken to prevent it, and if the matter were left an open question instead of stating distinctly that no settlement duties were necessary he would withdraw his motion.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER could not assent to the proposal.

Dr. SCHULTZ said it was unfair to press the motion, as unless the land was given entirely free, the recipients would derive no advantage.

In reply to the hon. member Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the people could not sell the lands until they came of age.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON could not vote for the motion under the explanation of Government, although he thought it right in principle. He hoped it would not be pressed to a division.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL also hoped a division would not be taken. The hon. member seemed to think that the Act imposed settlement duties, but such was not the case. If these duties were imposed the Indians would lose the only benefit the grant possessed.

Mr. FERGUSON said he must press his motion.

The resolution was declared lost on division, and the order discharged.

PROROGATION.

The SPEAKER gave notice that Parliament would be prorogued to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS IN MANITOBA.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said yesterday, a question on this subject was referred to the Standing Committee, and he had objected at the time that no meeting could be had, and on proceeding to the Committee room he found not one present, and he had been informed that only five had appeared. He thought the fact of the reference showed it was necessary that the matter should be dealt with this session, and he asked if the Government had any proposition to submit on the subject.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said when the reference was made, only five members of the Committee were absent, and the clerk was instructed to give notice of the meeting without delay, and at least 18 or 20 were summoned, but many members left the city after receiving the notices. If the Committee had met the questions could have been settled. The Government had no intention to move in the matter, and, of course, would bear the responsibility of not doing so.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said there was no statutory provision in Manitoba to regulate contested elections, and he regretted that a measure was not to be submitted, and he suggested that the quorum of the Committee should be reduced so as to allow a meeting to be held, and a Bill introduced and passed.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said Government was already to accept good suggestions, but if there was to be any responsibility, it would rest on those members of the Committee who had not attended the meeting when notified.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS.

On the motion of Mr. CARTWRIGHT that the House should go in Committee to consider certain resolutions whereon to found an address to Her Majesty on the subject of the withdrawal of garrisons and munitions of war from British North America,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought it should not be entertained inasmuch as it passed a censure on the policy of the Empire.

Mr. POPE also opposed the motion.

Mr. Ferguson.

He thought the sooner Canada learned how to take care of herself the better, and the strongest tie to bind the two countries together was the tie of mutual interest. Britain should not be asked to keep a single soldier in the country.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL hoped the motion would not be pressed. When Canada had been attacked on grounds affecting the Empire she had a right to Imperial aid, but Canada was loyal enough and strong enough to defend herself on every ordinary occasion, and he would not be sorry when the last British soldier left the country. The Imperial policy was settled and wise, and could not be complained of.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said any address of this kind ought to be carried, if carried at all, on a unanimous vote. The nature of the address proposed, however, was not in direct opposition to the Imperial policy, but only asked a garrison to be left at Quebec, and the Government had no objection to it. The Government had however done its best to retain as many troops as possible, but had failed, and very likely the present address would have no greater effect, and he would ask that the motion should, therefore, not be pressed.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the address was a mere endorsement of the Government Policy. He believed Canada should defend herself in quarrels of her own, but not in matters over which she had no control. Not only were the troops withdrawn, but stores and other material also, the want of which could not be supplied at once, and might prove very detrimental in case of a sudden attack. He however consented to withdraw the motion.

Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne) said the hon. member for Chateauguay had opposed entirely the vote for artillery, which was only necessary in consequence of the withdrawal of British troops, and it therefore seemed that he did not think the fortifications should be sustained at all. He thought the House had a perfect right to approach the Imperial Government on the question.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON, while opposing the artillery had intended to move an amendment embodying his views, and was only deterred from doing so because of the time of the session at which the militia estimates were discussed.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS moved the second-reading of Bill No. 101, an Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money re-

quired for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 13th June, 1871, and the thirtieth June 1872; and for other purposes relating to the public service.—Carried.

At 5:40 the House adjourned till 1 o'clock to-morrow.

FRIDAY, 14th April, 1871

The house met at one p. m.
After routine,

TELEGRAM FROM SIR J. A. MACDONALD.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER read the following telegram received from Sir John A. Macdonald respecting a statement made in Nova Scotia papers:—

"I see that Mr. Wilkins says he was denied a judgeship on account of his opposition, also that he was offered by Hon. Mr. Archibald a seat as Commissioner for assimilating the law. Take occasion to say in the House that he was never thought of as a Judge, and that it was the intention of the Government to put all the Attorneys General of the Provinces on the Commission for the assimilation of the laws" (hear, hear.)

REBELLION LOSSES IN MANITOBA.

Hon. Sir F. HINCKS wished to make an explanation respecting his remarks on the vote of \$40,000 for losses by the rebellion in Manitoba. In answer to the hon. member for Hastings he (Sir F. Hincks) had said that no Government could divert this money or any portion of it to liquidating claims of the Hudson's Bay Company. It seemed that a very different construction had been put on the remarks. He had merely said that the Hudson Bay Company's claims were of a very different character from those which this money was voted to meet; that this formed no precedent whatever for the Hudson's Bay Company's claims, and he wished to avoid any discussion as the Government were not prepared to entertain any such claims, but he did not entertain the opinion that this Government or any other Government could not pay the claims.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL asked whether any of the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, which he understood were very large, were to be paid by this Parliament.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS—Most certainly not. It is not the intention of the Government to pay any such claims (hear, hear).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS IN MANITOBA.

In reply to Dr. Schultz,

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER said the Baldwin Act would be the best rule to guide the House in the case of the Controverted Elections in Manitoba.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS moved concurrence in the amendments made in the Senate to the Bill respecting the metric or decimal system of weights and measures.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected; he could not understand the motive of the amendments, and thought the Bill ought to remain over. The Minister of Inland Revenue might be anxious to carry the Bill to contribute to his share of legislation, but it ought to stand over.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the amendment was simple and intelligible. The metric system, he believed, would yet be the International system of weights and measures. The Bill rendered it permissive, and defined its relation to our actual weights, and the amendment deferred its relation to the English system of Imperial measures. He thought the member for Chateaugay had not any Legislative record to boast of.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON would not seek for it beyond the present session. He had reversed the national policy as to the duties on coal and flour.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS knew that in the last hours of the session, the member for Chateaugay indulged in what he would call an elephantine playfulness. It was so unlike himself but he had to share the paternity of the change of duties with the member for Levis (Dr. Blanchet) and the House, and though he had been a Finance Minister he (Mr. Holton) could not point to a Budget, or a single measure of importance to the country originating with himself, though he admitted the service he rendered in maintaining a rigid adherence to the rules of Parliament.

SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS moved the third reading of the Supply Bill.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said it was not his intention to offer any extended remarks on this motion, as the session had been a short one and the events connected with it were fresh in the minds of all. The record of this session was made up on the journals of the House, and he, for one, was willing that that record should go to the country without note or comment from him at all

events. The session had undoubtedly been an eventful one. It was one that would be memorable in the annals of the country (hear, hear). There could be no doubt whatever about that, but it would be chiefly memorable for this very Bill of Supply now before the House. That Bill of Supply could be fitly characterized by one adjective in our language. It was a reckless Bill of Supply.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS was quite satisfied to let the Bill go to the country. The hon. member for Chateauguay had characterized this Bill as a reckless one. He (Sir Francis Hincks) should like to hear the hon. member criticize that recklessness. It was true that the estimates were large but, as he had explained on a former occasion it was in consequence of extraordinary expenditure for Public Works, which would have been undertaken by his predecessor, but for the bad condition of the finances. To say that there was anything in this Bill which would involve the Dominion in debt was to say that which could not be substantiated by any of the items in the Bill. The item of \$410,000 for taking the census, for instance, was a very large one, and formed a considerable portion of the extraordinary expenses of this year. He could go over the public buildings about to be constructed, all extraordinary expenditures, none of them which the Government would be justified in coming down to the House, and asking an appropriation for, but for the fact that they had an overflowing treasury in consequence of the prosperity of the country. He agreed with the hon. member for Chateauguay, that the flourishing state of the finances was what no Finance Minister could take credit for, but it had happened to be his [Sir F. Hincks'] good fortune to have a similar state of prosperity, whenever he occupied the position. He was quite satisfied that there was no difficulty whatever, with regard to meeting the charges which were placed on the country by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL said he had no intention to refer to financial matters, but would leave that to the hon. member for Chateauguay, and other abler hands than his own. He could not, however, let the remarks which had just fallen pass without comment. The Hon. Finance Minister had denied that the Supply Bill was open to the charge of being a reckless one. There were two or three features in it which would be regarded by the sober-thinking tax-payers of this country as fairly open to the charge made by the hon. member for Chateauguay. The Hon. Minister of Customs made a point in favor of the construction of the Pacific railway

by saying there was a constant increase in the revenue, and that the burdens this country was about to assume, would not be felt in consequence. But these extraordinary expenditures referred to by the Finance Minister were ever recurring. It had always been the case that the extraordinary expenditures eat up the surplus revenue, and in this growing Dominion with its ever increasing wants, it would always be the same. Looking at these facts, therefore, the hon. Finance Minister should regard these as normal instead of extraordinary expenditures. He thought the Government were fairly open to the charge of extravagance and restlessness in so far as they had refused to accept the suggestion approved of by nearly half of the members of this House irrespective of party, regarding the expenditure of \$6,000,000 in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He was satisfied that the Government had made a serious mistake in rejecting the suggestion to construct the Intercolonial on the narrow gauge system and to use ordinary instead of steel rails, and that they had mismanaged matters in dealing with the Intercolonial Railway. According to his calculation there would be between two and a half and three millions of dollars utterly wasted in that work, under the management of the Government (hear hear).

Mr. DONALD SMITH rose to make explanations respecting statements made in the speech of the hon. member for Lisgar [Schultz] yesterday.

Hon. Mr. MACDOUGALL objected to this irregular proceeding and said that the people of the country would come to regard the hon. member for Selkirk as a representative of the Hudson's Bay Co. sent to this House to rehabilitate them before the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON also condemned the course of the hon. member for Selkirk as irregular.

Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER moved that it be resolved that Mr. Speaker be authorized to direct the accountants of this House to pay respectively to the three members lately elected from Manitoba and attending the deliberations of this House, the full sessional allowance, deductions, however, being made at the usual rate for the number of days of their non-attendance at this session." He explained that the hon. members from Manitoba had not been able to attend the thirty days necessary for them to obtain their sessional allowance, in consequence of the delay in the election and the distance they were obliged to travel to reach Ottawa.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Hon. Mr. Holton.

Some formal business having been transacted, at 3:10,

The Usher of the Black Rod appeared and summoned the Commons to the Senate Chamber.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, 14th April, 1871.

The Speaker took the chair at 11 o'clock.

THE HIGH COMMISSION.

Hon Mr. RYAN asked whether it is the intention of the Government,—in the event of the Joint High Commission, now assembled at Washington, coming to any agreement or making any recommendation with reference to the question of the Fisheries, or of the disputed occupation of the Island of St. Juan,—to take such steps as may be requisite in order to afford the Parliament of the Dominion full information and an opportunity of expressing its opinion on these subjects, previous to concurrence or adoption by Government of any such agreement or recommendation of the aforesaid High Commission.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL replied that the Dominion Parliament would have full information on the subject.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On the Bill respecting Metric Weights and Measures, Hon. Mr. RYAN expressed his regret that so important a measure should be brought up at that stage of the session. He proposed some amendments which were adopted. The Bill was passed as amended.

A number of Bills came down from the Commons and were passed in due form.

PROROGATION.

At three o'clock His Excellency the Governor General came down to the Senate and having assented to a number of Bills, prorogued Parliament with the following Speech:

SPEECH.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In releasing you from further attendance in Parliament, I beg leave to express my warm acknowledgments for the diligence with which you have applied yourselves to the discharge of your public duties.

The Session has been brief, but work of importance has been accomplished, and I

may congratulate you on the prospect which is foreshadowed that in the future the Session of the Parliament of the Dominion will not make the inconvenient demands on the time of the members which it has done in the past.

The arrival in Ottawa, of the Representatives elected to serve for the Province of Manitoba, and their taking their seats in Parliament, mark signally the completion of the Union of that Province with the Dominion.

The Criminal, Militia and other Statute Laws, not in their nature inapplicable to Manitoba, have been extended to that Province.

The regulations for the Survey, and granting of lands in Manitoba were modeled on a system tested by experience, and will, by their liberality, offer a free home to all, without restriction, who desire to settle in the country and avail themselves of the advantages held out to them.

It shall be one of my earliest cares during the recess to take steps to negotiate on equitable principles with the Indian tribes in Manitoba and the North West Territory, in order to quiet their Titles to lands.

The Session which we are now closing has witnessed the consummation of the Union of Manitoba, and the adoption of the necessary initial measures to facilitate and ensure the admission of British Columbia into the Dominion.

The Addresses passed by the Senate and House of Commons I will transmit to the Colonial Secretary for submission to Her Most Gracious Majesty, and I trust Parliament will at its next Session have the satisfaction of viewing as an accomplished fact the union of all Her Majesty's Continental Possessions in North America, an object the attainment, of which even the most sanguine advocates of Confederation did not anticipate for many years to come.

I cherish the expectation that the result of the Census will demonstrate that the several Provinces of the Dominion have made a rapid advance in population and in all the elements of material prosperity during the last decade.

The Fisheries question is still under the consideration of the Joint High Commission at Washington, and I am confident that every effort is being made to secure such a result as will meet the reasonable expectations of the Canadian people, and tend to the preservation of lasting amity and good feeling between Great Britain and the United States.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I tender you my thanks for the readiness with which you have granted the supplies for the present year.

Honourable Gentlemen, and Gentlemen :

We have abundant cause for rejoicing at the present moment in the favorable state of the revenue and the thriving condition of many branches of National Industry. I gratefully acknowledge the loyalty of the people, and spirit of order and respect for the law which prevails in every part of the country, and I pray with all humility that these blessings may be of long continuance, and that He, from whom all good proceeds, may vouchsafe to look with favour on this Dominion.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

The following Bills received the Royal assent :—

An Act for the prevention of corrupt practices in relation to the collection of the Revenue.

An Act to establish one uniform Currency for the Dominion of Canada.

An Act to prolong for a certain time, the term allowed for the redemption of rents reserved on certain Indian lands in the Township of Dundee.

An Act to extend the provisions of the Act authorizing the imposition and collection of Harbour Dues by the Corporation of the Town of Owen Sound.

An Act to indemnify the members of the Executive Government, and others, for the unavoidable expenditure of Public Money, in excess of the Parliamentary grant, incurred in repelling the threatened invasion by the Fenians in 1870.

An Act to amend and explain the Act to amend the Charter of the Ontario Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Mutual Life Association of Canada.

An Act to make further provision for the government of the North West Territories.

An Act for more effectually preventing the desertion of seamen in the Port of Quebec.

An Act to amend the Act thirty-third Victoria, chapter forty, respecting the settlement of the affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada.

An Act respecting the loan authorized by the Act 32 & 33 Victoria, chapter 1, for the purpose of paying a certain sum to the Hudson's Bay Company.

An act further to amend the Acts respecting the improvement and management of the Harbour of Quebec.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to Duties of Customs.

An Act to incorporate the Sault St. Mary Railway and Bridge Company.

An Act respecting certain officers of the Trinity House of Quebec.

An Act to incorporate the Isolated Risk Fire Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Insolvent Act of 1869.

An Act to incorporate "The Confederation Life Association."

An Act to amend the Census Act.

An Act to incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to extend to the Province of New Brunswick, the operation of the Act of the Legislature of the late Province of Canada, concerning the Synod of the Church of England, in Canada.

An Act concerning the Vaudreuil Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Western Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.

An Act to comprise in one Act the Financial affairs of the Great Western Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bedford District Bank.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Sun Insurance Company of Montreal.

An Act to incorporate the Bank of Liverpool.

An Act to authorize the incorporated Village of Trenton to impose and collect Harbor Dues, and for other purposes.

An Act relating to the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Telegraph Company.

An Act to authorize the Northern Railway Company of Canada to make agreements for the leasing, using and working of the Lines of Railway of other Companies.

An Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbor of Quebec.

An Act to make provision for validating certain Premium Notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Insurance Companies.

An Act to authorize the sale of the Oakville Harbor.

INDEX

TO

DOMINION PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FIRST PARLIAMENT,

1871.

ACADIA FIRE ASSURANCE Co.
Correspondence, 645

ACCOUNTS

Members accounts, improper practices, 255
Between New Brunswick and Dominion, 482.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO SPEECH FROM THRONE

Debate in Commons, 16
Adopted, 26
Debate in Senate, 26
Adopted, 40
Congratulatory to Lord Lisgar, in Senate, 53
Do in Commons, 72
To Her Majesty, passed and ordered to be presented in Commons, 765
Do in Senate, 935

ADJOURNMENT—SENATE

Out of respect to deceased members, 11

AIKINS, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Bonds and securities; return submitted, 53
Annual Report of Secretary of State, 212
Return concerning Copyrights, 327
Withdrawal of Troops; Return submitted, 497

ALLAN, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Bill to incorporate Mutual Life Association of Canada, 325, 683
Second reading Bill to incorporate Mutual Life Assurance Association of Canada, 453

ALIENS

Bill to amend Act relating to naturalization of, 99
Bill to naturalize certain persons, 235

ANDERSON, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Death of 8

ANGLIN, Hon. Mr.

Enquiry concerning New Brunswick and Dominion Accounts, 482

ARBITRATION

Motion for correspondence on award, 80
Provincial, motion in Senate, 86
Question by Mr. GODIN, 143
Names of employees of Local Governments in connection with, 145
Further consideration of motion by Mr. BLAKE, 185.
Motion in Senate by Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DEST. JUST, 208
Papers referred to Printing Committee, 217.
Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST'S motion deferred, 234.
Motion deferred, 274
Motion for House in Committee on, 282.
Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST'S motion discharged, 356
Award, Address to Her Majesty, 360
Debate in Commons, continued, 421
Amendments, Mr. MILLS, Mr. JOLY, and Hon. Mr. DORION, 449, 450, 451

ARCHIBALD, Lt. Governor

Enquiry concerning, 501

ARMS

Given over to Imperial Government, 359

ASSIMILATION OF CURRENCY

Resolutions, Hon. Mr. HINCKS, 258.

BANKING, COMMERCE, AND RAILWAYS COMMITTEE

First Report of in Senate, Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, 85
Report of Committee, 885

BANK OF UPPER CANADA

House in Committee on, 742

BANKS AND BANKING

Bill to amend Acts concerning, 54
Resolutions; House in Committee, 455
Motion for House in Committee, 950
2nd reading of Amendments, 1030

BAY VERTE CANAL AND CANAL COMMISSION

Enquiry, Hon. Mr. DICKEY, 248
Reply to Enquiry, 536
Cost of Survey, 958

BEATY, Mr.

Bill to incorporate Toronto Corn Exchange, 328

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL

Expenditure upon, 821

BERTHIER VOLUNTEERS

Payment of, 329

BILLS read *pro forma* 5

To amend Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels, 2nd reading, 255
Banks and Banking, 1st reading, 255
To prevent corrupt practices in collection of revenue, 1st reading, 256
For Extradition of Criminals, 2nd reading moved, 342
Amendment thereto, 355
To authorize Trenton and Owen Sound to collect Harbour dues: Bill passed, 492
Loan to pay certain sum to Hudson's Bay Co. passed, 951
Act to amend Act concerning fishing by foreign vessels, 951
Bills passed, 958, 977, 978, 1020, 1081.
Bills from Commons—first reading in Senate, 958

BLAKE, Mr.

Imperial legislation for Manitoba, 61
Bill for Independence of Senate, 76
Question concerning Supreme Court Bill, 77
Motion for arbitration correspondence, 80
Motion for address for copies of orders relative to Railway Act, 146
Independence of Parliament; resolutions, 151
Dominion and Provincial Legislature; motion for correspondence, 160

BOUCHETTE, Joseph,

Memorial concerning, 733

SESSION 1871.

BOLTON, Mr.
Government Railway Tariffs, 330

BOURINOT, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Cape Breton Mail Steamers, 297

BOWMAN, Mr.
Question concerning Vegetable Ivory Nut, 277

BRITISH COLUMBIA
Motion, Mr. MACKENZIE, 43
Papers in reference to admission to Union, 178
Papers to be printed, 183.
Message accompanying papers relative to admission to union, 182
Admission to Union, 391
Notice of House in Committee, 456
Resolutions, Hon. Mr. SANBORN, 499
Statement of Imports, 593
Message from His Excellency, 527
Enquiry deferred, 535
Enquiry, Hon. Mr. MILLER, Senate, 557
Returns, Exports and Imports, 568
Notice of Bill, Hon. Sir GEO. E. CARTIER, 583
Enquiries concerning, 658
Admission into Union with Canada; Debate in Commons, 660
Question concerning, 683
Debate resumed, 692, 711 to 733
Notice of resolutions, 734
Report of Committee, 744 to 755
2nd Reading of Address, 756 to 765
Resolutions submitted, 772
Debate in Senate, 832 to 881, and 899 to 935
Lord Lisgar's answer to address concerning admission to Union, 1050

BRITISH COPYRIGHTS
Motion for address for correspondence, 174

BOURASSA, Mr.
Liquor Inspection Fund motion, 220

BROUSSEAU, Mr.
Arbitration Papers referred to Printing Committee, 217
4th and 5th Reports of Printing Committee, 503

BROWN, Mr.
Immigrant route to Manitoba, 329

BUREAU, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Montreal Water Police; notice of Enquiry, 235
Enquiry relative to prohibition of platforms at Lachine, 271
Observations on North West Territories, 298
Lachine Regatta, 356

BUDGET
Motion in amendment to, Hon. Sir A. T. GALT, 403; motion lost, 415

CAMPBELL, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Deaths of Hon. Messrs. ROSS, CRAWFORD, and ANDERSON, 8
Congratulatory address to Lord Lisgar, 53
Motion for appointment of Standing Committee, 67
Additional Members of Standing Committees, 75
Report of Postmaster General, 85
Motion for Committee to inquire into duties, &c., of Librarian and other officers and servants, 178
Papers in reference to admission of British Columbia to the Union, 178
Bill to provide for government of North West Territory, 234
Bill to extend Criminal Law to Manitoba, 274
Bill for Govt. of North West Territory, 274
2nd reading of Bill concerning Criminal Laws for Manitoba, 371
North Shore Railway Bill introduced, 416
Bill to amend Census Act, 432.
North Shore Railway Exemption Bill, 480
Bill for collection of Revenue, 536
Motion of sympathy with Mr. Speaker, 583
Bill concerning Drawbridges, 656
Penian Invasion; Bill to indemnify Members of Government, 705.
Report of Library Committee, 734
British Columbia, notice of resolutions, 734
Currency Assimilation, 2nd reading of Bill, 737

CAMPBELL, Hon. Mr.—cont.
British Columbia resolutions submitted, 772
Address to Her Majesty, 935.
Cost of survey of Bay Verte Canal, 958.
Report of Enquiry on False Bay Beach, 958
Bill for regulation of Library, 958
Notice of close of Session, 958
Report of the Director of Penitentiaries, 978
Canal Commission Report, 978

CAMERON, Hon. J. H.
Bill to amend Railway Act of 1868, 235
Members Accounts; improper practices, 255
Dominion Telegraph Co.; Bill to incorporate, 501
Ontario Bank; Bill to amend charter, 627
Dominion Telegraph Co.; Bill to incorporate passed, 1001

CAMERON, Mr. (Huron)
Bill to amend Act relative to naturalization of aliens, 99
Return of Insurance Companies, which had made deposits, 218
Lt. Governor ARCHIBALD; enquiry, 504
CANADA GAZETTE
Enquiry by Mr. Fournier, 643

CANADA, late Province of,
Settlements of surplus debts and arrears, 218

CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY
Bill to incorporate, 950

CANAL COMMISSION
Question by Mr. McGill, 56
Notice of Enquiry, 235
Enquiry, Hon. Mr. DICKEY, 500
Enquiry, Mr. KEELE, 502
Report presented, 642
Reply to Enquiry, 740
Report of Commissioners, 978

CANAL ENLARGEMENT
Correspondence concerning, 227

CANAL CONSTRUCTION
Debate upon, 688

CAPE BRETON MAIL STEAMERS
Question by Hon. Mr. BOURINOT, in Senate, 297

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.
Bill for protection of Navigable Waters, 54, 191
Withdrawal of troops; enquiry, 247, 359
Great Western Railway Act; affairs, 416
Address concerning withdrawal of Imperial troops, 819
Pacific Railway; question concerning, 1082
Withdrawal of Troops; motion concerning, 1087

CARTIER, Hon. Sir George E.
New Writ to be issued for Hastings, East Riding, 141
Library; remuneration and classification of its officers, 179
Elections; Temporary Provisional Law, 179
British Columbia; Papers to be printed, 183
Question of Order, 286
British Columbia; admission to Union, 301
Notice of Bill to amend Militia Act, 302
Bill to make temporary provision for election of members, 309
British Columbia; Notice of House in Committee, 456
Election Law; House in Committee, 457
Defence Returns, 536
British Columbia, notice of Bill, 583
Do Reports of Debate, 599
Debate on North West Territory; amendment, 647
British Columbia; admission to union; debate, 660
Red River Expedition; Return of vessels chartered, 710
Criminal Laws Manitoba; 2nd reading of Bill, 741
Indian Lands; 2nd and 3rd reading of Bill, 741
British Columbia; report of Committee, 744
Do Address to Her Majesty, 755
Do 2nd reading of Address, 755
Do Passed and ordered to be printed, 765

INDEX

CARTIER, Hon. Sir G. E.—*cont.*

Statement concerning prorogation, 817
Pacific Railway; motion for House in Committee on, 881
Railways, Canals, and Telegraphs; Report of Committee, 885
Manitoba and British Columbia; Bill to extend certain Acts to those Provinces, 942
Election Bill; motion concerning Lists of Electors, 967
Militia Act; extension to Manitoba and British Columbia, 977
Library; House in Committee on Salaries of Officers' servants, 977
Prorogation intended to take place on Wednesday, 979
Railway Act of 1868 amendment Bill, 1006
North West Territories; House in Committee to make further provision for Government of, 1025
Amendment to Mr. BLAKE'S motion on Manitoba controverted Elections, 1051
Telegrams from Sir John A. MACDONALD, 1089
Controverted Elections in Manitoba, reply to Dr. SCHULTZ, 1090.

CENSUS ACT

Bill to amend, 68
Report, 213
Bill to amend; House in Committee, 257
Do 3rd reading, 302
Message to Senate from Commons, concerning passage of, 357
Bill to amend, 2nd reading in Senate, 452
House in Committee on Bill to amend Act, 482
Bill to amend read a third time and passed, 499

CENSUS

Concerning means taken to secure accuracy, 1020

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Petition from concerning Usury Laws, 682

CHRISTIE, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Motion for address to ascertain number of persons on whom corporal punishment had been inflicted, 990.

CIVIL SERVICE

Enquiry concerning, 643

CLERGY RESERVES

Motion for address for statement of lands set apart as Clergy Reserves out of 27,857 acres surrendered by Mohawk Indians, in Township of Tyendinaga, 1005

CLAIM AGAINST GOVERNMENT

George Sterling's, motion by Mr. CURRIER, 826

COAL, COKE, AND FLOUR

New Brunswick Imports, 503

COLBY, Mr.

Insolvency Laws; Bill to repeal, 519
Customs Act; amendment to, 595
Insolvency Laws; motion for 2nd reading of Bill to repeal, 829

COLLECTION OF REVENUE

3rd reading of Bill for prevention of corrupt practices, 482
2nd reading of Bill in Senate, 536
2nd reading of amendment by Senate, 740

COMMITTEES

Standing and Special Report concerning, 71
On Standing Orders, 1st report, 76
On Public Accounts, 1st report, 76
On Banking and Commerce, 1st report, 76
On Standing and Private Bills; Act to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Company reported against, 990

COMMUNICATION

Lt. Governor MUSGRAVE to Governor-General, 564
Governor-General to Lt. Govr. MUSGRAVE, 564

CONFEDERATION LIFE ASSOCIATION

3rd reading of Bill, 627.

CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS

To Lord LISGAR, in Commons, 26
Do in Senate, 53
Do in Commons, 72, 73
His Excellency's reply, 182

CONNELL, Hon. Mr.

Unadjusted claims between Dominion and New Brunswick, 144
Whether New Brunswick losses by Fenian raids had been included in claims for indemnity, 218

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS

Question of privilege; no provision made for trial of Controverted Elections in Manitoba, 1051
Question by Hon. Mr. HOLTON, 1087
Reply to Dr. SCHULTZ, 1090

CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE, 990

CONVICTS

Returns of, 331

COPYRIGHTS

Return concerning, 327

CORRECTION

In report of Mr. FORTIN'S speech, 142

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

On whom had it been inflicted, Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE, 990.

COSTIGAN, Mr.

Question concerning improvements on the St. John and Madawaska rivers, 276

COUNTY COURT JUDGES

Bill respecting, 140.
2nd reading of Bill, 511

CRAWFORD, Mr.

Bill to amend Act concerning Banks and Banking, 54
Petition concerning Ontario and Quebec Railway, 235
Bill to incorporate Ontario and Quebec Railway, 235

CREDIT FONCIER

Bill to establish, 54
2nd reading of Bill referred to Banking Committee, 191

CRIMINAL APPEALS

Bill to extend right of, 76
Do 2nd reading, 509

CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS

Liability to defray cost of correspondence concerning, 959

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Motion for return of convicts in Penitentiaries, 288

CRIMINAL LAW BILL

Manitoba, 2nd reading postponed, 858
Do 2nd reading, 371
House in Committee on Bill, 455
2nd reading Bill, 741
House in Committee to extend laws now in force in Canada to Manitoba, 1026

CURRENCY

Motion for concurrence in resolutions for assimilation, 302
Petition from Halifax, in reference to assimilation, 480
Assimilation of, House in Committee; amendments and division list, 521 to 527
Enquiry, 557
Assimilation, 2nd reading of Bill in Senate, 737

CURRIER, Mr.

British American Bank Note Co.; enquiry, 501

SESSION 1871.

CURRIER, Mr.—COMMONS—*Cont.*

The Sterling claims, 502
Motion concerning George Sterling's claims, 826
Motion for Select Committee on Sterling's claims, &c., 1003

CUSTOMS

Notice to move House into Committee, 455

CUSTOMS DUTIES

Reply to Mr. Holton's Enquiry, 710
Bill to amend motion for 3rd reading and amendments, 881 to 883
Do 978

CUSTOMS ACT

Bill to amend, 2nd reading, 585
Amendments, 585 to 589
Debate resumed, 591 to 598,
House in Committee, 740.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES

By U. S. Officers in Lake St. Clair, 227

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE

Motion for House in Committee on, 942

DANGEROUS WEAPONS

Bill to amend Act concerning the carrying of, 140

DAW'S (Dr.) CLAIM

Motion concerning claim for medical service, 1006

DEBATES

Publication of; motion for employment of Stenographers, 823

DEFENCE—

Statement of Expenditure on account of, 43
Motion by Sir A. T. GALT, 50
Correspondence asked for; Mr. MASSON, 62
Mission of Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL to England, 70
Enquiry, 502
Returns, 536

DEPARTMENTAL APPOINTMENTS

Motion concerning, 1005

DEVER, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Interest; notice of Enquiry, 534, 703

DICKEY, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Inman Steamship Line; motion concerning, 211
Canal Commission; Notice of Enquiry, 235
Bay Verte Canal and Canal Commission, 248
Inman Steamship Line; Enquiry, 356
Geological Report; Enquiry, 453, 497
Canal Commission; Enquiry, 500
Geological Reports; Enquiry, 735
British Columbia; Debate, 832
Election Bill; amendments to, 1049

DICKSON, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Manitoba; Enquiry, 518

DOMINION TELEGRAPH Co.

Bill to incorporate, 501
Bill to incorporate passed, 1001

DOMINION DAY

Enquiry, 1001

DOMINION NOTES

2nd reading of Bill, 711

DOMINION CONSTRUCTION Co.

Bill to incorporate, 756

DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION

Bill to incorporate, 323

DORION, Hon. Mr.

Arbitration; notice for House in Committee, 282
Arbitration award; Address to Her Majesty, 360
Arbitration; amendment, 451
Quebec Savings Bank; rate of interest, 502
North West Territory; motion of amendment, 647

DORION, Hon. Mr.—*cont.*

British Columbia Debate; motion of amendment, 731
Election Bill; notice of amendment, 976
Member for Provencer; amendment, 1001
Pacific Railway; amendment, 1029

DREW, Mr.

County Court Judges; Bill respecting, 140
Provincial accounts; question, 143
County Court Judges; 2nd reading of Bill, 511

DUAL REPRESENTATION

Bill for Act to render members of Provincial Legislatures ineligible for sitting or voting in House of Commons, 198

DUFRESNE, Mr.

Credits Foncier; Bill to establish, 51
Fenian Raid Indemnity for, 59
Credits Foncier; second reading of Bill referred to Banking Committee, 191

DUNKIN, Hon. Mr.

Census Act, Bill to amend, 68, 184, 302
Report; Census Act, 213
Farmers Bank; Bill to incorporate, 567

DUTIES ON COAL, COKE, FLOUR, WHEAT, &c.

Motion for repeal of, 247

DUTIES

Bill to amend Customs duties, 958

EASTERN & NORTH AMERICA RAILWAY

Rolling Stock of; Enquiry, 323

ELECTIONS BILL

Introduction of notified, 71
Electoral Divisions
Readjustment of in New Brunswick, 142

ELECTIONS

Hochelaga Election Committee's Report, 11
Temporary Provisional law of, 179
Bill to make temporary provision for, 309
House in Committee, 457
Motion concerning Lists of Electors, 967
Second reading of amendments in Committee, 979
In Manitoba; question concerning, 1087

EMIGRATION AGENT

Mr. J. Moylan; address relative to, 278

ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS

Representation of; Enquiry, 41

ESTIMATES.

Message from His Excellency, 276
Explanations by Hon. Sir F. HINCKS, 1032

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCES

House in Committee to establish draft of Bill to be submitted to Imperial Parliament, 1027

EVENING SESSION

Suggestion, 1005

EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT

Bill to indemnify, 567

EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS

Bill concerning, 54

FARMERS' BANK

Bill to incorporate, 567

FALSE BAY BEACH

Enquiry in Senate, 735
Report of Enquiry, 950

FEMALE CONVICTS—

Bill to provide for detention in Reformatory Prison, 599

FENIAN RAID

Indemnity; question concerning, 59
Correspondence with Imperial Government, 61
Canada claims against United States, 160

INDEX

FENIAN RAID—*cont.*

Indemnity for expenditure of \$200,000, 1183
Whether New Brunswick losses had been included in claim, 218
Message from His Excellency received, 256
Indemnity to Government for Expenditure, 317
Report of Committee on Expenditure on account of Invasion, 457

FISHERIES

Correspondence; Enquiry concerning, 6
Explanations in view of meeting of Imperial Commission, 13
Correspondence asked for, 43
Correspondence submitted to House, 56
Question in Senate concerning, 66
Motion in Senate for returns to stand over, 75
Question by Sir A. T. GALT, 79
Motion in Senate for correspondence, 130
Bill to amend Act relative to fishing by foreign vessels, 178, 326
Motion for address for regulations and papers emanating from Governor in Council, 246
Notice of address for copies of correspondence between Marine and Fisheries Department and Admiral Wellesley, 281
Protection Bill; 3rd reading and passage, 315
Foreign Fishing Bill House in Committee, 743

FINANCE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Explanation, 275

FORBES, Mr.

West Indies; Enquiry, 60

FORSYTH MINING COMPANY

Bill to incorporate, 455

FORTIN, Mr.

Correction in report of Speech, 142
Canada, late Province of; settlement of surplus debts and arrears, 218
Rimouski; Harbour of Refuge at; correspondence concerning, 220
Bouchette, Joseph, copies of Petition, 645

FOURNIER, Mr.

Question concerning Famine in France, 78
Intercolonial Railway; Question, 183
"Canada Gazette"; Enquiry concerning, 643
Inspection of Fish; correspondence concerning, 102

FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Postmasters to take account of all free mail matter passing through their hands, 331

FRANCE

Famine in; question concerning, 78

FREDERICTON & ST. MARY'S BRIDGE Co.

Bill to incorporate, 591
3rd reading postponed, 641

GALT, Hon. Sir A. T.

Fisheries, explanations in view of meeting of Imperial Commission at Washington, 13
Correspondence concerning Fisheries asked for, 48
Defence, motion concerning, 50
Mission of Hon. Mr. Campbell to England, 70
Question concerning Fisheries, 79
International Commission; motion, 99
Budget; motion in amendment to, 403
Defence; Enquiry, 502
British Columbia; amendment to address concerning, 762
Sterling's claim reverted to, 829
Census; question concerning means to secure accuracy, 1020

GALLERIES CLEARED

Strangers in Gallery, 655

GENDRON, Mr.

Postage on Agricultural Newspapers; Enquiry, 643

GEOLOGICAL REPORT

Enquiry in Senate, 453, 497, 735

GEORGE STERLING

Correspondence about claims 502, 1003

GIBBS, Mr.

Petition for extension of charter of Ontario Bank, 235

GODIN, Mr.

Arbitration, Provincial, question concerning, 143
Do Motion for names of employees of Local Governments in connection therewith, 145
Insolvent Act; Bill to amend, 359, 512, 710

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

Resolution concerning Nova Scotia roads, 289

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY TARIFF

Motion for correspondence concerning, 330

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Interference of at elections, 885

GOULET, ELZEAR

Respecting death of in Manitoba, 141

GRAIN AND FLOUR

Imports of, 333
Returns, 416

GRAIN AND FLOUR DUTIES

Petition from Montreal Board of Trade, 75

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY

Motion for statement of earnings, 42

Question concerning, by Mr. P. JONES, 77

Motion concerning returns of, 333

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY

Petition reported on in Senate, 248
Financial affairs of, 416
2nd and 3rd Reading of Bill relative to Company, 765

HAMILTON AND PORT DOVER PLANK AND STONE ROAD COMPANY

Enquiry, 340

HARBOUR MASTER, HALIFAX

Papers submitted, 359

HARBOUR DUES

Trenton; 2nd reading of Bill, 506
Owen Sound; 2nd reading of Bill, 506
Do in Senate, 683, 734
Trenton, in Senate, 705, 772

HARRISON, Mr.

Isolated Risk Fire Insurance Co.; Bill to incorporate, 455
Toronto and Nipissing Railway; Bill to establish powers of, 455
Dangerous Weapons; Bill to extend law, 511
Pacific Railway; Petition from Mr. Alfred Waddington, 585

HAZEN, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

British Columbia; Enquiry, 497
Currency; notice of Enquiry, 517, 557
British Columbia; Enquiry deferred, 535
Uncurrent Nova Scotia Notes, 658
British Columbia; Enquiries concerning, 658

HEMLOCK BARK

Export duty recommended, 466

HIGH COMMISSION

Enquiry concerning in Senate, 1093

HINCKS, Hon. Sir Francis

Public Accounts submitted, 42
Defence; statement of expenditure submitted, 48
Royal Canadian Bank Charter, 54
Public Accounts referred to Committee, 71
Exportation of American Silver and new Silver coins, 69
Unforeseen expenses; return of, 69
Public Accounts; 1st Report of Committee on, 76
Banking and Commerce; do 75
Fenian Invasion; Indemnity to Government, 183
Supply to Her Majesty; motion of concurrence in report of Committee, 184
Banks and Banking; Bill relating to, 255
Fenian Raid; Message from His Excellency, motion concerning, 256
Finance Department Employees; Explanation,

SESSION 1871.

HINCKS, Hon. Sir Francis—*cont.*

Inspection Laws ; Consolidation of, 302
 Supply; House moved into Committee, 317
 Savings Banks ; House Committee, 317
 Supply; Motion to receive Report of Committee, 342
 Sterling Exchange; Returns of amount purchased in 1870, 416
 Banking Resolutions ; House in Committee, 455
 Inspection Laws ; House in Committee, 457, 741
 Savings Banks ; House in Committee on, 463
 Reception of Report on, 483
 Ways and Means : Reception of Report of Committee, 483
 Inspection Laws ; Report of Committee, 517
 Oakville Harbour ; House in Committee, 520, 582
 Insurance Companies ; House in Committee, 520
 Supply ; Report of Committee, 520, 568, 581, 582
 Insurance Companies ; Return submitted, 520
 Currency Assimilation ; House in Committee, 521
 Metropolitan Bank ; Bill to incorporate, 567
 Executive Government ; Bill to indemnify members of, 567
 Port Warden, Quebec ; House in Committee, 584, 742
 Imperial Guarantee Loan ; House in Committee, 584
 Dominion Notes ; 2nd reading Bill, 741
 Bank of Upper Canada ; House in Committee, 742
 North West Loan ; House in Committee, 742
 Insurance Companies ; do 744
 Public Accounts ; Report of Committee, 744
 Insurance Companies ; 2nd reading Bill, 756
 Customs Duties ; Bill to amend ; motion for 3rd reading, 881 to 883
 Banking and Commerce ; Report of Committee, 885
 Customs and Inland Revenue ; motion for House in Committee, 942
 Railway Gauge ; consideration of resolution, 95 ; Intercolonial Railway, 942
 Banks and Banking ; motion for House in Committee, 950
 Loan to pay a certain sum to Hudson's Bay Company, 951
 Bank of Upper Canada ; respecting settlement of affairs—amendment Act, 951
 Supply ; explanations, 952
 Banks and Banking ; second reading of amendments to, 1030
 Estimates ; explanations concerning, 1032
 Supply ; motion for report of Committee, 1053
 Rebellion Losses in Manitoba : Explanation, 1039
 Supply Bill ; 3rd reading, 1090
HOCHLAGA ELECTION COMMITTEE
 Final Report of, 54
HOLTON, Hon. Mr.
 Enquiry concerning proposed Railway Bridge over Lachine Canal, 41
 Montreal Warehousing Company ; motion concerning, 44
 Railway Bridge, Lachine Canal ; motion for report of Chief Engineer of Public Works Department, 174
 Duties on Coal, Coke, Flour, and Wheat ; motion for repeal of, 247
 Amendment in Provincial Arbitration debate, 448
 Customs Act amendment, 585
 North West Territory Debate ; amendments, 649, 650
 Montreal Warehousing Company ; motion, 765
 Question concerning opening of St. Lawrence Canals, 989
 Evening Session ; suggestion, 1005
 Controverted Elections in Manitoba ; question, 1087
HOUSE OF COMMONS
 Return from Senate Chamber, 5
HOUSE EMPLOYEES
 Motion concerning, 1005
HOWE, Hon. Mr.
 Manitoba Returns, 417
 North West ; no intimation of insurrection
 Personal attack ; allusion to, and explanation, 1082

ILLEGAL MARRIAGES

Bill to legalize, 641
ILLEGAL SEIZURES
 Motion for correspondence, 644
IMPERIAL GUARANTEE LOAN
 House in Committee, 584
IMPERIAL TROOPS
 Address concerning withdrawal of, 819
INDEPENDENCE OF SENATE
 Bill, 2nd reading of, 653
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT
 Resolution, Mr. BLAKE, 151
 Act to amend Act, 1022
INDIAN LANDS
 2nd and 3rd reading of Bill, 741
 Remarks concerning, 827
 Motion for address for correspondence in reference to Public Lands in Ontario, about which there was no treaty of reservation to Indians, prior to 1st July, 1867, 1005
INDIANS OF THE DOMINION
 Returns submitted, 341
INLAND REVENUE
 Question, Mr. STEPHENSON, 74
 Official Returns and Statistics, 185
 House in Committee, 566
 Report of Committee, 567
 Manitoba ; 2nd reading of Bill, 741
 Reduction of Excise duty on Spirits manufactured from molasses in bond, 977
INMAN STEAMSHIP LINE
 Motion concerning contract with Post Office Department, 211
 Enquiry in Senate, 356
INSOLVENT ACT OF 1859
 Bill to amend, Mr. SAVARY, 213
 Do Mr. GODIN, 359
 Do 2nd reading, 512
 Do Mr. MAGILL, 599
 Do House in Committee, 710
INSOLVENCY LAWS
 Motion for 2nd reading of Bill for Act to repeal, 829
INSPECTION LAWS
 Consolidation of, 302
 House in Committee, 457
 House in Committee to consider resolution for consolidation of, 496
 Report of Committee, 517
 Bill to repeal, 519
 2nd reading of Bill, 741
INSPECTION OF FISH
 Address for correspondence concerning, 1002
INSURANCE COMPANIES
 Return of Companies which had made deposits, 218
 Returns submitted, 342
 House in Committee, 520, 582, 744.
INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA
 Bill to incorporate, 528
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY
 Motion, Mr. MACKENZIE, 43
 Question, Mr. MILLS, 61
 Motion, Mr. STIRTON, 64
 Notice of motion in Senate, Hon. Mr. WARK, 75
 Motion concerning contracts, Mr. F. JONES, 80
 Question, Mr. FOURNIER, 143
 Motion in Senate, Mr. BOTSFORD, 248
 Motion in Senate for Select Committee, Hon. Mr. WARK, 266
 Hon. Mr. Tessler, Senate, added to Committee, 327
 Returns ; Enquiry concerning, 341
 Motion for returns, 503.
 Report of Select Committee, 991
 Consideration of report of Select Committee, 1008
INTEREST
 Notice of Enquiry, 534
 Enquiry, 703

INDEX.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION, 76
Motion, Hon. Sir A. T. GALT, 99

IRON COMPANY
Forsyth's Iron Company's Petition referred back to Committee, 657

IRVINE, Hon. Mr.
Final report of Hochelaga Election Committee, 24

ISOLATED RISK FIRE INSURANCE Co.
Bill read a third time and passed, 711
Motion to report Bill back to Committee, 958

JONES, Mr. F.
Grand Trunk Railway; question concerning, 77

JONES, Mr. (Halifax)
Intercolonial Railway; motion for returns, 503
Amendment to Currency Assimilation Scheme, 522

Railway Supplies, Nova Scotia, Enquiry, 643
Acadia Fire Insurance Co.; Correspondence, 645
British Columbia; amendment to debate upon, 711

KEELER, Mr.
Dominion Day—Enquiry, General Holiday, 502
Lake Ontario; Light Houses on; question, 959

KINGSTON BOARD OF TRADE
Bill to incorporate, 518

KINGSTON & PEMBROKE RAILWAY Co.
Bill to incorporate, 455, 711

KIRKPATRICK, Mr.
Railway Act of 1868; Bill to amend, 359
Kingston & Pembroke Railway Co.; Bill to incorporate, 455
Kingston Board of Trade; Bill to incorporate, 518, 950
Forsyth Mining Co.; Bill to incorporate, 455
Promissory Notes, Stamp Act; Enquiry, 600

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE
Proposed Railway Bridge; Enquiry, 41
Correspondence, 417

LACHINE REGATTA
Motion in Senate for address concerning, 356

LACHINE CANAL CULVERTS
Motion in Senate for reports, 710

LAKE ONTARIO,
Light Houses on, 959

LANDS IN MANITOBA
Withdrawal of motion concerning, 1085

LANGEVIN, Hon. Mr.
Montreal Warehouse Co.; papers submitted, 235
Public Works; Report of Minister, 301
Statutes; Return concerning distribution of, 328
Lachine Canal Bridge correspondence, 417
St. Peter's Canal; Repairs upon, 447
Bay Verte Canal; Reply to Enquiry, 536
Lachine Canal Bridge; Returns, 566
Canal Commission Report presented, 642
Quebec Harbour Bill, 660
Canal Commission; reply to enquiry, 740

LANGLOIS, Mr.
Amendment to Bill for Extradition of Criminals, 355

LAPUM, Mr.
Municipal Loan Fund; enquiry, 710

LAWS RELATIVE TO PROPERTY
Uniformity of in all the Provinces, 217

LAWS, ASSIMILATION OF
Preliminary Report, 141

LEGISLATIVE UNION
Enquiry concerning, 277

LETELLIER DEST. JUST, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Fisheries; motion for correspondence, 139
Provincial Arbitration; motion deferred, 234
Post Office Riviere Ouelle; notice of Motion, 235
Provincial Arbitration; motion discharged, 356

LIBRARY

Motion for Committee to inquire into duties, classification, and remuneration of Librarian and others, 178, 179
Report of Committee in Senate, 734
Bill for regulation of, 958
Salaries of officers, &c., 977
Act in relation to; second reading of, 1081

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' SALARIES
Enquiry in Senate, Hon. Mr. Miller, 407

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR ARCHIBALD
Enquiry, 504

LIQUOR INSPECTION FUND
Motion by Mr. BOURASSA, 220

LISGAR
Dr. Schultz, member for, introduced, 950

MCALLUM, Mr.
North West Expedition; statement of vessels to carry men and materials, 282

MACDONALD, Hon. Sir John A.
Congratulatory address to Lord Lisgar, 26
Fisheries correspondence; submitted to House, 56
Elections Bill; introduction of notified, 71
Congratulatory address to His Excellency, 72
Report of Postmaster General presented, 99

MACDONALD, Mr. (Lunenburg)
Assimilation of Currency; amendment, 523

MACDONALD, Mr. (Glengarry)
St. Peter's Canal; Statement of tolls, 336
Railway; Coteau Landing to Ottawa; Bill to incorporate, 359
Montreal & Ottawa Junction Railway Co., 627
S. J. Dawson; motion for reports of 710
Delay in Printing Bills, 815

McDOUGALL, Hon. Mr.
Emigration Agent; instructions to Mr. J. G. Moylan, 278
Question of privilege, 296
Strangers in the Gallery, 655
Mutual Life Association of Canada; Bill to incorporate, 950
North West Territory; Resolutions concerning, 959
Motion for address for amendment of surveys, 1007
Lands in Manitoba; withdrawal of motion, 1085

MACFARLANE, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Sworn in, 5
Address in answer to speech, 26

MACFARLANE, Mr.
First Report of Committee on Standing Orders, 76
Railway Act of 1868; motion to amend, 76, 506
Postmaster's salaries; Enquiry concerning deficiency in emoluments, 276
Fourth Report of Committee on Standing Orders, 301.

McGILL, Mr.
Duty on Coal; question concerning, 55
Canal Commission; question by, 56
Red River Expedition; address relative to appointment of Chaplains, 164
Canal Enlargement; correspondence concerning, 227
Insolvent Act of 1869; Bill to amend, 599

MACKENZIE, Mr.
Fisheries; if intention of Government to bring down correspondence, 6
Manitoba Representatives; information desired, 11
Grand Trunk Railway; statement of earnings, 42
Manitoba; address for Governor Archibald's instructions, 42
Unforeseen expenses; detailed statement of, 43
British Columbia; motion, 43
Intercolonial Railway; motion, 43
North West correspondence; motion, 43

SESSION 1871.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—*cont.*

St. Clair Flats Canal; motion for correspondence, 62
 Departmental Reports; when to be submitted, 65
 Fenian Raid; Canada claims against United States, 160
 Superannuation Act; question concerning, 685
 British Columbia; amendments, 733, 756
 Government Officials; interference at elections, 885
 McGreevy's claim; motion concerning, 1005

MACPHERSON, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Forsyth Iron Company's Petition, 657
 Ontario Bank; Bill to amend charter, 709
 Owen Sound; Harbour dues, 734

MAILS

Arrival and Departure of 335
 Fortnightly between Halifax and Liverpool, 417

MANITOBA

Address for instructions to Lt.-Governor Archibald, 42
 Bill to extend Criminal Law to, 274.
 Immigrants Route to, 329
 Returns, 417
 Bill from Senate to extend certain laws relating to timber, 492
 Enquiry, 518
 Election Returns; question concerning, 659
 Member for Selkirk introduced and seated, 686
 Motion for address to His Excellency, 735
 Collection of Revenue, 818
 Bill to extend certain Acts to, 942
 Military Expedition to, 1002
 Duties of Excise, 1021

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Papers connected with Act of last Session, 212
 Report of Minister of, 482

MARINE HOSPITAL, RICHIBUCTOU

Enquiry, 417

MARINE POLICE

Statement of Expenditure in 1870, 566

METROPOLITAN BANK

Bill to incorporate, 567, 765

MARRIAGES

Mr. Bowell's Bill discharged, 832

MASSON, Mr. (Soulanges)

Defence; Correspondence asked for, 62
 Red River Expedition; orders in Council concerning, 277
 Fisheries; Correspondence between Department and Admiral Wellesley, 281
 Intercolonial Railways; Enquiry, 643
 Conduct of soldiers in North West, 821
 Beauharnais Canal; Expenditure upon, 821
 Manitoba; Military expedition to, 1002

MASSON, Mr. (Terrebonne)

Arms given over to Imperial Government, 359

MEETING OF PARLIAMENT

Senate Chamber, 1

MEMBERS REMOVED

From House of Commons since previous Session, 5

MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS AND ASSEMBLIES

Bill to render ineligible for seats in House of Commons, 54

MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER

Had been a member of Riell's Government alleged, 992

MERRITT, Mr.

Welland Canal; Lake Erie, level of, 239

MESSAGE

In reply to address of congratulation, 76
 From Commons, intimating appointment of Library Committee, 85
 From His Excellency, thanking Senate for Loyal address, 98
 Agreement between Imperial and Dominion Governments, relative to admission into Union of Manitoba, 213
 From Commons respecting Census and Revenue Act, 518
 Do Bills passed, 657
 Do Transmitting Ontario Bank, and Ontario and Quebec Railroad Bills, 685
 Do to Senate, 704, 734
 From His Excellency, Supplementary Estimates, 942
 From Senate, 1093

MILITIA

Notice of Bill to amend Act, 302
 Enquiry concerning report of Department, 1482
 Extension of Act to Manitoba, 977.

MILLER, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

St. Peter's Canal; Explanation, 250
 Equalization of Judge's salaries, 474
 Lt.-Governors' salaries, 497
 British Columbia; Enquiry, 557

MILLS, Mr.

Intercolonial Railway; question, 61
 Dual Representation, 198
 Fisheries; notice for address for papers emanating from Governor in Council, 246
 Arrival and departure of mails, 335
 Extradition of Criminals; Bill for, 342
 Arbitration, Provincial, amendment, 449
 British Columbia; statement of Imports, 503
 Orders in Council; Departmental regulations, 644
 Do Motion for Printing, 710
 Do Motion concerning, 822
 Indian Lands; Remarks concerning, 827
 Admission of Provinces into the Union, 1002
 Indian Lands; address for correspondence, 1005

MISCELLANEOUS

Certain Bills passed, &c., 1049, 1093

MITCHELL, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Fisheries; Fishing by foreign vessels, Bill to amend, 326
 Lachine Regatta; Returns in connection with, 655
 Trinity House, Quebec, 735

MONEY ORDER POST OFFICE

At Indiana; Enquiry, 218

MONTREAL WAREHOUSING Co.

Motion concerning, 44
 Papers submitted, 236
 Motion, 765

MONTREAL WATER POLICE

Notice of Enquiry, 235

MONTREAL POST OFFICE

Enquiry respecting site of new office, 328

MONTREAL & OTTAWA JUNCTION RAILWAY Co.

3rd reading of Bill, 627, 772

MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE

Petition concerning amendments to Bill respecting Weights and Measures, 683
 Petition from, 978

MORRIS, Hon. Mr.

Bill to prevent corrupt practices in collection of revenue, 256
 Weights and Measures; inspection and metric system, 302
 Customs; notice to move House in Committee, 455
 Manitoba Inland Revenue; resolution concerning, 482, 744
 Corrupt practices in collection of Revenue, 482
 Weights and Measures; Report of Committee, &c., 516, 740
 Inland Revenue; Report of Committee, 567
 Metric system, 741

INDEX.

- MORRIS, Hon. Mr.—*cont.***
 Rockwood Asylum ; House in Committee, 744
 Duties of Excise in Manitoba, 1021
 Weights and Measures ; motion for concurrence in amendments made in Senate, respecting decimal system, 1090
- MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND**
 Enquiry, 710
- MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA**
 Bill to incorporate, 325, 453, 683, 1001
- MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES**
 Stamps on Premium Notes Bill, 514
- NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS**
 Bill to amend Act relating to, 99, 510
- NAVIGABLE WATERS**
 Bill for protection of, 54, 191
- NAVIGATION AND SEAMANSHIP**
 Schools for teaching, 239
- NEW MEMBERS**
 Senate—Hon. Messrs. Macfarlane, Northup and Perry, 5
 Introduced into Commons, 6
 Mr. Fournier introduced, 13
 Hon. Mr. Panet sworn in, 74
 Hon. Mr. Churchill, 85
 Mr. Pearson introduced, 179
 Hon. Messrs. Smith and Read sworn in, 208
 Mr. Delorme introduced in Commons, 942
- NEWSPAPER POSTAGE**
 Removal of ; question, 77
- NEW BRUNSWICK SYNOD**
 3rd reading of Bill, 656
- NORTH WEST**
 Motion for correspondence, Mr. Mackenzie, 43
 Motion for return of indemnity claims, 62
 Admission of Rupert's Land, &c., to Union, 220
 Bill to provide for its Government, 234, 274
 Motion for address for statement of vessels chartered to carry men and materials, 282
 Observations on, 298
 Amendments, Bill for Government of, 327
 Enquiry, 504
 No intimation of insurrection, 520
 Debate resumed, 646, 649
 Loan, 742
 Resolutions concerning, 961
 House in Committee, 1025
- NORTHERN RAILWAY CO. OF CANADA**
 Motion for leave to introduce Bill, Mr. POPE, 328
 Act to authorize agreements for leasing lines of railway of other Companies, &c., 992
- NORTH SHORE RAILWAY**
 Bill introduced in Senate, 416
- NOTICE OF PROROGATION**
 In Commons, 1087
- OAKVILLE HARBOUR, 520**
 House in Committee, 582
- ODELL, Hon. Mr.—SENATE**
 Statue of Her Majesty ; Enquiry, 777
- OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT**
 Motion concerning, 1023, 1024
- ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY BILL**
 Petition, 99
 Bill to incorporate, 235, 627, 772
- ONTARIO BANK, 235, 627**
 Bill to amend charter, 709
- ORDERS IN COUNCIL**
 Read to House, 213
 Motion for printing, 710
- ORDER**
 Question of, 286
- OWEN SOUND**
 Bill to authorize collection of Harbour Dues, 235
- PACIFIC RAILWAY**
 Mr. Waddington's Petition, 585
 House in Committee on, 881
 That Railway should be worked and constructed by private enterprise, 1027
 Question concerning, 1082
- PANET, Hon. Mr.—SENATE**
 Sworn in, 74
- PAQUET**
 Payment of Volunteers, 329
 North Shore Railway ; Enquiry, 642
- PARLIAMENT**
 Motion for Bill to secure independence of, 301
- PATENT ACT**
 Question concerning, 77
 Bill to amend, 141, 828
- PELLETIER, Mr.**
 Master and Mates of seagoing ships, 502
- PENSION LISTS**
 Order of House, 645
- PENITENTIARIES**
 Report of the Director, 978
- PERSONAL ATTACK**
 Allusion to, and explanation, 1082
- PERRY, Hon. Mr.—SENATE**
 Sworn in, 5
- PETERBORO & OTTAWA RAILWAY**
 Petition concerning, 683
- PICKARD, Mr.**
 Return of moneys received on account of Private Bills, 502
- POLASKI CLARKE**
 Bill to naturalize, 519
- POSTMASTERS**
 Remuneration of, 226
 Salaries, 276
 Salary of Postmaster, Kingston, N. B. ; enquiry, 417
- POPE, Mr.**
 Motion for leave to introduce a Bill for an Act concerning Northern Railway Company of Canada, 328
 Seigneurial Act ; municipalities entitled to indemnity, 959
- PORT WARDEN, QUEBEC**
 House in Committee, 584, 742
- POSTAGE**
 Agricultural Newspapers, 643
- POST OFFICE**
 Riviere Ouelle, 235, 270
 Toronto, 359
- POWER OF PARLIAMENT**
 Establishment of Provinces, 1081
- PREMIUM NOTES**
 Bill to remove doubts concerning, 275
- PRESQUE ISLE**
 Motion for address for correspondence, 335
- PRINTING**
 Joint Committee on, 86
 Report of Committee, 287, 301, 452, 499, 503, 536, 827
 Delay in Printing Bills, 815
- PRIVATE BILLS**
 Return of moneys received on account of, 528
 Various amendments to, 817, 950, 958
- PRIVATE BILLS**
 Time to receive petition, for, extended, 656, 663, 703, 734, 735
- PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE**
 First Report of, 75
- PRIVILEGE**
 Question of, 296, 327

SESSION 1871.

PROMISSORY NOTES
Stamp Act; Enquiry, 600

PROROGATION
Statements concerning, 817, 979

PROROGATION
In Senate Chamber, 1098

PROVENCHER ELECTION
Petition from Wm. Dease, 979

PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS
Question, 143

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
Submitted, 42
Referred to Committee, 71
Report of Committee, 744

PUBLIC BUILDINGS
Halifax, 625

QUEBEC
Petition from Merchants for repeal of flour, coal and grain duties, 482
Marine and Fire Insurance Co.; Bill to incorporate, 599
Harbour Bill; improvement and management of, 660, 743

RAILWAY ACT OF 1868
Bill to amend 76, 235, 359, 506, 1006

RAILWAY BRIDGE
Lachine Canal, 174
Exemption Bill, 708
Drawbridges; Exemption Bill, 1080

RAILWAY
Coteau Landing to Ottawa; Bill to incorporate, 359

RAILWAY, KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE
Petition of County of Frontenac, 235

RAILWAYS, CANALS, AND TELEGRAPHS
Report of Committee, 885

RAILWAY GAUGE
Consideration of resolution, 95; Intercolonial Railway, 942

RAW HIDES
Petition from Montreal Traders, 497

READ, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Sworn in, 208
Harbour dues, Trenton, 2nd reading of Bill, 705

REBELLION LOSSES IN MANITOBA
Explanation, 1089

RED RIVER EXPEDITION
Appointment of Chaplains, 160
Motion for copies of Orders in Council concerning, 277
Return of vessels chartered, 710

REGATTA
Enquiry relative to prohibition of platforms at Lachine, 271

RENAUD, Mr.
Change of duties on Flour, &c., 217
Port Cognac, an inland Port, 359
Marine Hospital, Richibuctou, 417

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL
For 1870, 85, 99

RICHIBUCTOU HARBOUR
Remarks concerning, 475
Enquiry, 535

RIEL
Whether extradition had been demanded, 1001

RIMOUSKI
Harbour of Refuge at, 220

RIVIERE OUELLE POST OFFICE
Motion for address concerning, 271

ROSS, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Death of, 8

ROSS, Mr. (Dundas)
Imports of Grain and Flour, 333
Amendment in British Columbia Debate, 730

ROSS, Mr. (Prince Edward)
Member for Provencher alleged to have been a member of Riel's Government, 992

RYAN, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Inspection Laws; Petition from Dominion Board of Trade, praying for consolidation, 74
Raw Hides; Petition from Montreal Traders, 497
Drawbridges over navigable rivers; petition concerning, 655
Bouchette, Joseph; Memorial concerning, 733
Petition from Montreal Board of Trade, 978
The High Commission; Enquiry, 1003

RYAN, Mr.—COMMONS
Lachine Canal Culverts, 710

ROUTINE BUSINESS
In Senate, 1082

SANBORN, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Synod Bill; Suspension 60th Rule, 566
Report of Private Bills Committee, 703
Report of Committee on Private Bills, 734
Time for receiving Reports and Petitions extended, 656, 683, 735, 958
Standing Orders Committee; Reports of, 85, 325, 473
Printing Committee; Reports of, 371, 452
Union Bank Lower Canada; Petition reported on, 248
Quebec Bank; Petition reported on, 248

SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE Co.
Bill to incorporate, 659, 991

SAVINGS BANKS AND DOMINION NOTES
House in Committee to consider certain resolutions, 257, 317, 463
Reception of Report upon, 483
Quebec Savings Bank: rate of interest, 502

SAVARY, Mr.
Insolvent Act of 1849; Bill to amend, 213
Criminal Prosecutions; liability to defray cost of correspondence concerning, 959

SEAFORTH VILLAGE
Bill to annex withdrawn, 711

SCHULTZ, Dr.
Controverted Elections in Manitoba, 1090
SCOTT MURDER
Punishment of murderers, 1036

SECRETARY OF STATE
Annual Report of 1912

SEIGNIORIAL ACT
Municipalities entitled to indemnity, 959
SESSION
Close of 958

SEYMOUR, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Letter of Alfred Garneau to be expunged from Senate Journals, 990

SILVER QUESTION
Statement asked for, 44
Exportation of American Silver and new Silver Coins; explanation, 69
Concerning withdrawal of 20 cent pieces, 78
ST. CLAIR FLATS CANAL
Motion for correspondence, 62

SIMPSON, Mr.
Act to incorporate Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., 950

SIMPSON, Hon. Mr.—SENATE
Printing; 5th Report of Committee, 499
Do Report adopted, 297, 358

INDEX.

- SMITH, Hon. Mr.**
Legislative Union; Enquiry concerning, 277
- SOLDIERS**
Conduct of in North West, 218
- SPEAKER, OF SENATE**
Motion of sympathy with, 583
- SPEECH**
From the Throne, 3
To be taken into consideration, 5
Copy of presented to House, 6
- STAMPS**
Sale of; motion for return, 143
Duties; House in Committee for Bill to remove doubts, 1006
- STANDING COMMITTEES**
Appointment of, 67
Additional members of, 75
Reports, 85, 473
- STANDING ORDERS**
Fourth Report of Committee, 301, 825
- STATUE OF HER MAJESTY**
Enquiry concerning, 977
- STATUTES**
Return concerning distribution of, 328
- STERLING'S CLAIM**
Reverted to, 829, 1003
- STERLING EXCHANGE**
Question concerning, 829
- STREET, Mr.**
Vessels attached for debt, 417
- ST. PETER'S CANAL**
Inquiry concerning, 209
Explanation, 250
Motion for address for statement of tolls, 336.
Repairs, 417
- ST. JOHN AND MADAWASKA RIVERS**
Question concerning intended improvement, 276
- S. J. DAWSON**
Motion for reports, 710
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS**
Question concerning opening of, 989
- SUN INSURANCE Co.**
Bill to incorporate, 381
Do withdrawn, 599
- SUPERANNUATION ACT**
Question, 686
- SUPPLY TO HER MAJESTY**
Motion of concurrence in report of Committee, 184
House moved in Committee, 317
Motion to receive report of Committee, 342
House in Committee, 493, 528
Report of Committee, 568 to 582
Halifax Public Buildings Debate, 628
House in Committee, 899, 952
Supplementary Estimates passed *pro forma*, 1048
Reception of Report and Debate on Supplementary Estimates, 1048
Motion for reception of Report, &c., 1054 to 1080, 1088, 1090
- SUPREME COURT BILL**
Question concerning, 77
- SYDNEY, MARBOU HARBOUR AND FALSE BAY BEACH, C. B.**
Notice of motion, 248
- SYNOD BILL**
Bill to extend provisions to New Brunswick, 501, 536, 566
- TARIFF**
Change of duties on Flour; Question, 217
- TELEGRAM**
From Sir John A. Macdonald, 1089
- TESSIER, Hon. Mr.—SENATE**
Arbitration, Provincial; Motion; 86
- THE HIGH COMMISSION**
Enquiry concerning, 1093
- TORONTO CORN EXCHANGE**
Bill to incorporate, 328, 627
- THOMPSON, Mr. (Haldimand)**
Money Order Post Office, at Indiana, 218
Hamilton and Port Dover Plank and Stone Road Co.; Enquiry, 340
Militia Department; Enquiry concerning report of, 482
Franking Privilege; Postmasters to take account of free mail matter, 331
- TILLEY, Hon. Mr.**
Act respecting Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, 950
Act to extend Act of Late Province of Canada, concerning Church of England Synod in Canada, to New Brunswick, 950
Manitoba; collection of revenue, 818
Grain and Flour imports 1870; returns, 418
- TORONTO AND NIPISSING RAILWAY**
Bill to establish powers, 455
- TREMBLAY, Mr.**
Vote by ballot; Bill introduced, 583
- TRENTON**
Bill to authorize village of to collect Harbour dues, 213
- TRINITY HOUSE, QUEBEC**
Bill respecting office, 735
- TUPPER, Hon. Dr.**
Harbour Master, Halifax, 359
Marine and Fisheries; report of Minister, 482
Marine Police; Statement of expenditure 1870, 566
- UNADJUSTED CLAIMS**
Motion for correspondence between Dominion and New Brunswick Governments, 144
- UNCURRENT NOVA SCOTIA NOTES**
Question concerning, 658
- UNFORESEEN EXPENSES**
Returns of, 69, 99
- UNION BANK, LOWER CANADA**
Petition reported on, 248
- UNIFORM CURRENCY**
Bill to establish, 492
- VAUDREUIL RAILWAY Co.**
2nd and 3rd reading of Bill, 765
- VEGETABLE IVORY NUT**
Question concerning, 277
- VESSELS ATTACHED FOR DEBT**
House in Committee, 417
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS**
Standing Committees, &c., 6
- VOTE BY BALLOT**
Bill introduced, 583
- WALLACE, Mr.**
Eastern and North American Railway Company—Rolling stock of; Enquiry, 328
- WARK, Hon. Mr.—SENATE**
Intercolonial Railway; notice of motion, 75
Do motion for Select Committee, 266
Do Report of Select Committee, 901
Richibuctou Harbour, 473, 535
- WAYS AND MEANS**
House in Committee on resolutions, 465

SESSION 1871.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Inspection, and introduction of Metric System, 302
Uniform system of, 496
Report of Committee, 516
2nd reading of Bill, 740
Metric system to be permissive, 1021
Motion for concurrence in Senate amendments, 1090

WELLAND CANAL

Motion for papers relating to Lake Erie Level, 239

WEST INDIES

Enquiry, 600

WILMOT, Hon. Mr.—SENATE

Privilege; remarks concerning aspersion on, Hon. Mr. MILLER, 327
Synod Bill; to extend provisions of to New Brunswick, 501, 656

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS

Enquiry, 217, 359
Papers submitted, 497
Motion concerning by Mr. CARTWRIGHT, 1087

WORKMAN, Mr.

Montreal Post Office; site for new building, 328
Sterling Exchange; question, 329
Sun Insurance Co., 583, 599
Insurance Company of Canada; Bill to incorporate, 528

YOUNG, Mr.

Joint Committee on Printing; notice to Senate, 76
Aliens; Bill to naturalize certain persons, 235
Dominion Rifle Association; Bill to incorporate, 328
Post Office, Toronto; Returns of Tenders for, 359
Confederation Life Association; 3rd reading of Bill, 627

BINDING SECT. FEB 4 1974

Government
Publications

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
